

C O L U M B U S

THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

A BI-MONTHLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF
THE EV. LUTHERAN CHURCH.

EDITED BY THE FACULTY OF CAPITAL UNIVERSITY.

VOL. V.—No. I.

F E B R U A R Y , 1 8 8 5 .

COLUMBUS, OHIO:
LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN OF THE OHIO SYNOD.
1885.

Monies Received for Volume V.

L. Hamman, C. Nagel, Rev. S. Gundersen, Rev. S. Hunziker, C. J. W. Belser, And. Simon, Rev. J. H. Kline, Rev. C. H. Meyer, Rev. E. Born, Rev. E. Cronenwett, Rev. J. O. Hoffman, Rev. P. G. Schmogte, Rev. J. H. Schneider, Rev. C. W. Knuth, Rev. G. A. Harter, Rev. Schillinger, Rev. G. Mochel, Schuh Bros, Rev. G. W. Lose, Rev. C. J. Althoff, Rev. P. S. Swinehart, Rev. L. Vogelsang, Rev. K. Hemminhaus, Rev. G. A. Wetzel, Rev. Wm. Schmidt, Rev. E. L. T. Engers, Rev. H. A. Allwardt, W. Trump, Rev. F. Wendt, Rev. Ed. Pfeiffer, Rev. Baeehler, each \$2.00, Rev. C. F. Seitz, Rev. J. Bock, G. A. Dobler, Rev. M. Walter, each \$4.00, C. A. Schaefer, E. R. Bailey, Rev. A. Birch, each \$1.00.

T H E
COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE

Vol. V.

FEBRUARY, 1885.

No. 1.

THE DISCIPLINE OF THE WILL.

As the personality of man asserts itself principally in the will and this is the controlling power in his soul, it would, on a superficial view of the subject, seem absurd to speak of subjecting it to any regulation. But a more careful consideration will lead to a different conclusion. There is no absurdity in speaking even of self-government and self-denial. It is possible to exercise control over the will, and it is important that this should be done. That the statement seems self-contradictory and certainly has intricacies only renders it the more necessary to give it attention.

That entity which we call self is human nature differentiated in the individual. Each individual man is a person. He has human nature. That which distinguishes him from the brute he has in common with all other persons. But he has that also which is characteristic of this individual as distinguished from all other individuals. Each person has the human nature which all others have, and has the individuality which no others have. A person has a subsistence of his own and has his own distinctive character. He has human nature, but this and the person are not identical. In logical phrase, human nature has greater extension, person has greater intention. A person has all that belongs to human nature and has that in addition which differentiates him from all other persons. He has the nature of all other men, but he is none of those other men: he is himself, having his own subsistence and his own individual properties. If all other men ceased to exist, human nature would still

exist in him; if he were destroyed, human nature would still exist in others, but this person could have ceased to exist. Self is human nature in its personal modification.

This self is a complex of powers. It can know and feel and will. But it must be remembered that all these powers belong to the person. He knows, he feels, he wills. It would be erroneous to assume that the intellect, the sensibility and the will are three independent entities each of which performs its own distinct functions independently of the others. They are all powers of one and the same person, and their activities all emanate from one and the same agent. That agent is self. I myself know and feel and will. It is therefore not true that my knowing and feeling have nothing to do with my willing. These are three distinct operations, and are therefore ascribed to three distinct faculties; but my knowing and feeling and willing cannot be ascribed to three distinct persons. It is the same self that performs the distinct operations, and that self which has the distinct powers also controls their action. The soul remains a unit in all the diversity of its operations.

We are aware that apparently there is an inconsistency when we coordinate the will with the intellect and the sensibilities as the three great powers of the mind, and yet maintain that it is master among them. That has the appearance at least of saying that of the three coordinates two are subordinated to the third. But that is a misapprehension. The points of view are different in the two statements. The mind performs three general kinds of operations, and with reference to that fact we divide its powers into three classes, designating them as intellect, sensibility and will. As regards the kinds of operation they are strictly coordinate. The person acts in these three distinct modes, and that person, the self, performs them all and controls them all. They are all his acts. But when we inquire whether the authority of the person asserts itself in the same way in each, we enter upon a different question. It does not. In that respect the will is the dominant power. It chooses, it originates action. That is its specific function. Self rules over all, and it gives its ultimate decisions in its volitions. The will is not an entity that rules over two other entities called intellect and sensi-

bility, but the person who knows and feels also performs the decisive function of willing.

These faculties cooperate in accomplishing the work of man. Each has its own office, but all work together and are dependent on each other. It is conceivable indeed that there might be a creature having knowledge without any feeling, or feeling without any knowledge, monstrous as such a creature would be; but it is not even conceivable that there would be volition without either. The assumption that would render it possible is self-destructive. We cannot will without knowing some object to which the will is directed and without having some desire moving in that direction; if action be supposed that is devoid of such guide and impulse, it is manifestly not action of will. The will would not only be blind, but would cease to be will at all, if it were dissevered from the other faculties. The person wills, but the person who wills also knows and feels, and does not will without reference to what he knows and feels. The knowing and feeling have an influence on the willing. He knows and feels, and as a knowing and feeling person he wills. He may will unwisely, but he cannot, in the absolute sense, will blindly. That would be no willing at all, but instinctive impulse. Where there is will there must be intelligence, however low it may be in degree, and also desire, however little of emotion may indicate its presence.

The intellect and the sensibility do not act in the same free way as the will. When an object is set before us in space, the cognition is given us whether we desire it or not. The senses are adapted to perception, and the perceiving, when all the conditions for performing the act exist, is not a matter of choice. It is true, we may close our eyes or our ears and thus shut out knowledge. But we must see an object and hear a sound before we can judge it to be expedient to close against them our organs of sight and hearing. When an appetite or an emotion presents itself in our consciousness, we are not at liberty to cognize it or not. It has come into view as an object of knowledge, and our willing has no control over the fact. We may, indeed, turn our attention away from it and avoid more particular inspection of it or brooding over it, but the cognition has been

forced upon us. When a demonstration is brought before us, the judgment, if it perceives the evidence, cannot withhold assent. Proof perceived necessitates conviction. We may refuse to act in accordance with the conviction wrought, but we cannot by an act of will nullify the demonstration. The intellect is, to the extent illustrated, subject to the necessity in its cognitions. The same is true of the sensibility. The hungry person cannot set aside the desire for food, the loving mother cannot suppress pity for her suffering child. The corresponding action may be refused, and the feeling may to some extent be alleviated by fixing the mind upon other objects which are suggestive of other feelings; but the action of our feelings, when the objects adapted to excite them are presented and cognized, is inevitable. All experience shows that pains and pleasures, desires and aversions, loves and hates, are introduced or excited without our volitions, and that our will cannot bid them come and go at pleasure.

In the estimation of some these are concessions that place the whole doctrine of the will's freedom in jeopardy. Those who seek only the truth will of course concede plain facts, whatever may be the consequences. But the freedom of the will is a fact of consciousness, and is so necessary as a basis for all thinking on moral questions, that we need not fear its overthrow by a hasty and false application of other facts. Reasonable people will first examine the matter. We do concede the fact that our intelligence and our sensibility have not the power to avoid the cognition or the emotion when once the object of knowledge and the incitement to feeling are before it. These are facts that every one daily experiences.

But these facts do not militate against the liberty of the soul in willing. For, in the first place, the will is not bound by the necessary action of the other faculties under their proper conditions. What we have maintained and what we insist upon is not that the intellect and sensibilities are under no necessity of performing their functions when the proper conditions are given, but that the will is free. The mind must perceive what is placed before its senses, admit what is apodictically proved, love what presents and commands itself as lovely. The mind is under a natural necessity in this regard. But that does not imply that it is under a similar

necessity in every other respect. Knowing and feeling are not willing, and what pertains to the former does not on that account pertain also to the latter. The mind has a self-directing power, notwithstanding the relative necessity under which some of its faculties perform their operations. Even in the action of these latter faculties such power is apparent. He can close the avenues of sense against the introduction of perceptions; we can turn our attention away from proofs which would lead to disagreeable conclusions; we can displace unpleasant feelings by directing the mind to objects which necessarily produce those of a different character. We cannot change the nature of our faculties and of their modes of operation, but we can change the conditions and thus subject operations that are necessary to the free action of the will. This is the power by which the personality exercises its controlling authority, and the necessity under which the other faculties lie interpose no barrier to that self-control.

In the second place, we have not maintained an absolute liberty of self-government. On the contrary, there are limits to the power and liberty of the will. It has intrinsic alternative power. That belongs to its nature as will; it could not be will without it. But as man's will it is created, and thus limited. It has not omnipotence at its command. Whether intrinsically it would be impossible to will what it is impossible to execute is a speculative question that has no practical utility. Perhaps a person might will to create an atom or a world. What a madman may do cannot be so easily determined. But the will must keep within the bounds of that which is known, and normally it does keep within the bounds of that which is regarded as possible. Moreover, our judgment in regard to the wisdom or righteousness of an act, and our appetites and desires as excited by our environments, all have an influence on our volition. The liberty of the will is thus not in itself infringed, but the area of its action is circumscribed. Even if it be assumed that it has intrinsically unlimited power of choice, so that it could select from all objects and actions within its knowledge for its volition, practically it is confined, in the exercise of its power, to the narrow domain contained within the lines drawn by the surrounding influences at any given moment. A man has the

intrinsic power to will the taking of a walk in London as well as in New York, but practically he cannot, on a fine morning when he is in New York, will at that hour to walk in the streets of London. He could not do this, however strong might be his desire, not because the will has absolutely no power for such a volition, but because he knows that it is absolutely impossible to execute the volition. He has the intrinsic power to will the paying of a visit to the Corcoran Gallery, but if he has never heard of such a place and does not even know of its existence, he cannot exercise his will power in putting forth such a volition. He has the intrinsic power to will the reading of Milton at any hour, but when he is hungry and has before him the means of satisfying his appetite, he is not likely to will the enjoyment of the poet under such difficulties. There is no impossibility in the latter case, but the improbability is so great that we can count with a confidence bordering on certainty that he will choose the food in preference to the poetry, because the impulse to the former is more pressing. It is evident that there are some circumstances which are relatively necessitating in particular volitions, and others which are so influential in producing them that they present probabilities so strong as to be practically certainties. While the will, in virtue of its nature, is not bound by an iron necessity to put forth just the volition which it does, but has the power of alternativity and can choose between two or more actions, or between acting and not acting, it is limited in the exercise of its power by the circumstances in which the person puts forth his volitions.

These circumstances originate from two distinct sources. One is the divine, the other the human will.

There is, in the first place, a Providence that shapes all the events of this world and assigns to every creature the place for which its powers are adapted. The great God who made all things not only upholds them all by the word of His power, preserving their general nature and their particular qualities, but also freely and wisely directs all to the accomplishment of His own ends. In this government of all things God uses the forces which He has placed in His creatures and which are usually called second causes, but is not Himself subject to their operation or restricted to their use.

He accomplishes His purposes by them, if possible; without regard to them, if necessary. Over these divine volitions man has no control, except so far as God has been pleased to adapt His government to His people's prayers. Where and when a man was to be born and when and where he shall die, is not a matter dependent on his will. Even the suicide cannot end his life without the permission of God, who could easily, if he chose, so order events as to render the accomplishment of such a purpose impossible. By this providence of God the area of our volitions is circumscribed. We exercise our will as our condition and calling suggests. The American does not will as the European; the merchant does not will as the mechanic; the man does not will as the woman. The situation suggests these volitions, and the situation is the result of God's providence. The will has liberty, but it exerts its power and uses its liberty where the person is, not where he is not, and in the circumstances in which he is, not in circumstances in which he is not. God has given us liberty, and does not by His providence destroy it; but neither does He suffer our liberty to dethrone Him as the mighty and merciful Monarch of all. His creatures are all subject to Him; in Him we live and move and have our being; of Him and through Him and to Him are all things, to whom be glory forever. There could be no divine government without involving such a limitation of the sphere within which the free will of the creature is exercised.

But there is also, in the second place, a limitation arising from the exercise of the human will. Our volitions, so far as they are of an executive as distinguished from a generic character, control our own bodily organs and, to some extent, our own mental operations; but they do not, in their direct operations, extend beyond this. When I will to lift my arm, the act willed immediately takes place; when I will to write, the muscles of the arm obey the mandate and the pen is at once in motion. But the same cannot be said if my volition should refer to others. I desire that my neighbor should go to church; but a volition in that direction would be useless. His limbs will move at the bidding of his own will, but not at that of mine. Man is like God in the freedom of his will, but he is not like God in his power, so that what he uncon-

ditionally wills must inevitably take place. He is man, and that means impotence. His fellow man is his peer, and has a will of his own. The exercise of others' liberty of will may hamper mine. And this takes place in fact. My will to write at this hour may be effectually prevented, not only by the providential visitation of lameness in the arm, but by some human being's will to put manacles upon me or deprive me of writing materials. In business and in pleasure our volitions are determined by the prior volitions of others by whom we are surrounded. They do not coerce our wills by irresistible impulsions or by acts of violence; they have no power for that; but they can produce conditions under which our choice will be limited by our own reason and desire. Some of these conditions will be such as to render acts impossible that might otherwise have been willed; some are such as to make it plain that acts to which there are even impelling desires would be unwise.

Even our own will may circumscribe the area of its action. Generic volitions often draw a line beyond which our executive volitions are not permitted to pass. Men not only may, but largely do adopt controlling principles which determine their actions. The miser's volitions are directed by his love of money, and what contravenes the gratification of this ruling passion is excluded from the domain of his volitional action. The Christian's area of willing is limited by his conscience; in virtue of his determination to follow Jesus he cannot will what he knows to be wrong.

The fact is undeniable that, without derogating from the intrinsic liberty of the will, there are various circumstances which exert a great deal of influence upon its determinations. The will in its intrinsic nature is free to exercise its powers, to which, considered in themselves, there are no assignable limits. Men may will against the will of God and against the will of their fellow men, and may, so far as the inherent power of will is concerned, do this when the execution would be foolish or impossible. It should be remembered that willing is a different thing from executing what is willed. But practically there are limitations to the exercise of volitional power. Its area is circumscribed by Providence and by circumstances depending on human volitions, whether our own or those of other persons.

For our purpose it is an important question whether self, our own personality, has any control over these determining circumstances, and if so, how far such control extends. Obviously it would be absurd to speak of governing the will by its own imperative acts designed directly to influence its action in particular cases. The special volition which is put forth is not determined by another antecedent special volition, and this by another in infinite series. Self determines each special act of will, and the executive act has no cause but self. I will to write at this moment, not because some prior volitions have necessitated this as an effect of which they are the inevitable cause, but simply because I will it. Freedom of willing is not necessitation by causes determining the choice to one particular act while an alternative would otherwise have been possible, but it is exemption from all necessitation, internal or external. Hence when the will performs its proper function in willing there can be no propriety in speaking of directly determining that executive act of the will by another executive act of the same will. There are generic volitions which control the particular, but there can be no particular volitions which control themselves or exert a direct uncontrolling influence over other particular volitions. We do not will one particular act in order that we may will another particular act. The design which embraces a number of consecutive acts renders the corresponding volition generic. There is a manifest absurdity in the thought of outwitting ourselves by putting forth a volition which would necessitate a volition that is desired, but that is not willed. But this by no means implies that there is an absurdity in alleging self-control to be possible. All experience testifies that there is such a possibility. Nay more, conscience urges it upon mankind as a duty. All feel that they are blameworthy when they perform injurious acts, and at least all intelligent persons feel that the blameworthiness attaches not only to the external act, but primarily to the volition which gave it birth. The volition should have been otherwise. It is recognized that the person should have had better control of himself, and he accordingly censures himself and is censured by others. "He that is slow to anger is better than the mighty, and he that ruleth his spirit than he that

taketh a city." Prov. 16, 32. While it is manifest that the special volitional actions do not control special volitional actions, it is equally manifest that these volitional actions are largely under the control of the person whose actions they are. Self has power both over the circumstances and over the bent and disposition under whose influence it acts. Although this power is not absolute, it is certainly sufficient to justify the approbation or the censure which mankind passes upon the exercise or the absence of self-government.

There is, in the first place, in each human person the power in some measure to control the circumstances in which his will power is exerted and by which its operations are to some extent determined. He can choose his environments. We say that in some measure he has control of circumstances in this respect. He cannot choose the place of his birth and the influences exerted upon him in infancy and childhood. There is a great deal that lies beyond the reach of his power. But he can, when the years of discretion are attained, decide for himself what his surroundings shall be. He may associate with persons who are addicted to vice, or with persons who walk in the path of virtue, with those who seek the true and pursue all useful knowledge, or those who follow the false and specious and find nothing desirable in truth for its own sake; with those who rejoice in that which is chaste and beautiful, or those who have no taste for the charms of nature and the amenities of art; with those who wallow in the mire of sensual indulgence, or those who find no pleasure in the prostitution of human powers to beastly appetites. He can choose his own surroundings in this regard, and as he chooses will the area of his volition be determined. He may select books and papers for reading that will pander to all that is base and mean in human nature, or such as will be influential in cultivating all the higher powers of the soul and directing it to things that are lovely and of good report. He may devote himself to a business that will surround him with influences whose tendency is to drag him downward, or to an occupation that will be favorable to culture and virtue. We do not overlook the teaching of Holy Scripture that every calling in which men may serve their fellow men in the fear of God is noble, because it is a loving service, and

that in that respect the calling of an ostler or a cook is as worthy as that of a minister or a king. But there are occupations which men and women pursue against the will of God and which are both sinful and disrespectful; there are occupations in which, although men who pursue them are declared respectable, no true service of love is rendered to our neighbor and which are without any divine warrant; there are occupations which, although they are useful and may be pursued without sin or shame, are yet of such a nature that the weak, or those whose weak side would be especially influenced by them, should not select, because to them they are dangerous. Men have the power of choice in such matters. They have, furthermore, their choice of recreations and amusements. There are some that are degrading; there are others that tend to elevate. Men cannot eschew all recreations and still be healthy and wise, but they can select such as will subserve the purpose of amusement and promote the person's welfare in general. And not only may a person thus choose his employments and enjoyments, and so far be himself the master determining the area of his volitions, but he may even within that area exercise his power of choice. He cannot help seeing or hearing what presents itself to his senses, but he can, when he knows that sights and sounds which are injurious will be thrust upon him at any given point, refuse to encounter them and give them the opportunity to force on him their cognition; or, if he sees and hears what is harmful in its influence, he can refuse to fix his attention upon it, and thus hinder its further influence upon his imagination. He can turn his thoughts away from the cognition which was inevitable. So in regard to objects tending to awaken desires which his judgment condemns. When the objects adapted to awaken such desires are presented, these arise spontaneously; but the person has power to turn away from such objects, thus placing himself beyond the reach of their direct influence, or to divert the mind from the activities which have been already aroused, thus reducing, if not destroying, the power which they exert. In these and in various other ways the person has control over that which, through his intellect and sensibilities, exerts an influence over his will, and is thus master over his volitions.

Nor is he wholly without power over his environments even as these are providentially determined. Certainly the power of man over matter and mind, as compared with that of the Creator and Governor of all, is very little, and any attempt to use the infinitesimal against the infinite is simply ridiculous. While we can to some extent apply the forces of nature to serve our own purposes, thus making them obedient to our will; while we can choose our own climate and community, so far as there is variety presented from which to select; while we have some power over the presentations of sense, and even of consciousness, by directing our attention to one and averting it from the other,—we cannot change the nature of the creation nor the plan of its government. But we can use the privilege of prayer which God has given to His children, and which is provided for in the plan according to which He governs all things. Whatever speculative difficulties may present themselves in regard to such appeals to a Father's love when contemplated in their relation to the laws of nature and the uniformity of its operations, practically there is no difficulty. The Christian asks as God commanded, and confidently clings to the promise that he shall receive, leaving it to the omniscience and omnipotence of Him who gave the command and promise to find ways and means of making good His word. He remembers, moreover, that the laws of nature are not decrees of supposed Fate to which God Himself is subject, but that they are merely generalizations which men have made of God's mode of operation through His various creatures; they are man's reading of God's plan of government. He who made that plan did not forget to take the prayers of His children into the account; and if our mind despairs of finding a way in which such a vast diversity of petitions could be worked into a scheme of perfect order, we need but be reminded that God did not assign that herculean labor to our pigmy powers. He who accomplishes by a word what to us are even absolute impossibilities has attended to that Himself. "The fervent effectual prayer of the righteous man availeth much," and by it we may do much towards changing those surroundings by which our volitions are affected. "God makes all things work together for good to them that love Him." And although such privilege and power

belongs only to believers, He has provided a way also by which man may attain the gift, so that they may confidently ask, and the Ruler of the universe will order everything for their welfare.

Having such varied powers in regard to the things around him, as well as in regard to the operations of his own mind, man may indirectly exercise control over his own volitions. This control pertains primarily to the determination of the area in which liberty of the volitional power may be exercised. As our cognitions and desires furnish the objects and suggest the acts from which the choice is made, we exercise control over the volitions so far as we control these antecedent mental operations. So far, therefore, as we choose our environments, whether this be by changing the condition of things around us, or by changing our own position and thus securing different surroundings, we influence our willing. So far, moreover, as we exercise power over the presentations to our intellect and over the desires awakened, whether such exercise be by closing the avenues of perception or by directing attention from one object and directing it to another, we again influence our volitions. The discipline of the will must therefore consist largely in the proper exercise of these powers in order to effect volitions worthy of man's high endowments and mission.

These endowments, by the right use of which man's mission is to be fulfilled, are not only manifold, but they are of different kinds. In every man's consciousness, moreover, these different kinds present themselves as different in dignity. Upon some a higher estimate is placed than upon others. It is not necessary to offer proof that a life of virtue is preferable to a life of sensuality. Even the sensualist admits this, and could choose the life of virtue if it were as easy as that of indulgence in sensual appetite. It is not on the ground that the interests of the soul, because it is immortal, must be cared for by the wise man rather than the interests of the body, which will soon return to the dust whence it was taken, that mankind generally assign the higher place to virtue. That argument is undoubtedly valid. But it is not by this logical process that most persons have their assurance in this regard. It is not because virtue is

more profitable, but because it is inherently better and known to be better, that mankind gives it the preference. Not that all men choose a virtuous life. That is not the fact. Not all volitionally prefer virtue, but intellectually they do give it the preference. It stands higher in the universal judgment of mankind. Even those who will the gratification of their appetites as these present themselves, admit that it would be better to deny such gratification when it contravenes love and righteousness. They follow their desires, not their judgment. There is really no difference among men in their judgment respecting the relative superiority of some desires over others.

Man has animal desires in common with the brute. They are connected with his bodily organization, and their gratification is effected through bodily organs. Although they are emotions of the soul, they would not and could not exist apart from the body. The disembodied spirit is exempt from them. They may be summarily designated as the alimentary and sexual appetites. In the divine economy they have the obvious purpose of self-preservation. They prompt to that which is necessary to sustain the individual and propagate the species. That brutes have the same promptings does not render them unworthy of man. Their gratification is not in itself base or debasing. It is right to eat and drink, to be active and to rest. Our bodily organization requires it. Life could not be preserved without it. "Marriage is honorable, in all, and the bed undefiled; but whoremongers and adulterers God will judge." Heb. 13, 4. It is not eating and drinking and resting and cohabiting that is base and ignoble. Only when these are abused, and thus illicit, are they vile and brutish. The glutton and the drunkard, the sluggard and the debauchee are condemned; but eating and drinking, resting and procreating are not in themselves gluttony and drunkenness, sluggishness and debauchery. These terms designate the vice which consists in the abuse of powers in themselves necessary to the accomplishment of God's design. Every excess transcends that design; and when these appetites become the ruling powers in an individual, he sinks to the level of the brute in his principle of action, while he sinks far below the brute in his excesses and in the subordi-

nation of nobler powers to those which he has in common with brutes. The voice of humanity is unanimous in declaring these to be lower than other powers which man possesses, and in demanding that these should be subordinated to others, not others to them. A right discipline of the will must have regard to this voice. Guided by a current appreciation of the different powers of the mind and their relation to human destiny, the wise man will so regulate his movements as not to give an undue prominence to that which is merely animal. As he has the area of liberty largely under his control, he will so determine it that the cognitions presented and desires awakened will not lie too much in the domain of sense. What is necessary and reasonable in this regard will be accorded, what is injudicious and prejudicial to the higher interests of the soul will be avoided. He who spends his time among wine-bibbers and lewd women has still liberty of volition, but the objects and acts presented from which the choice is to be made is of a character that in any event will be likely to secure a bad choice. Where all is evil the choice cannot be good. The only remedy in such a case is to change the area of volition. Any choice in a dramshop or gambling-house or brothel will be lamentable, except that of fleeing from the place of temptation and danger. Whatever may be said of the power of resistance when passions are aroused, it is certain that safety lies in avoiding temptation, the power for which is unquestionable. We can choose our own surroundings with their influence, through inevitable cognitions and desires, on our volitions, and should so choose them as to bring the will into the service of man's higher interests.

But these higher interests, though all superior to the animal wants, are again of different degrees of dignity. There are rational desires whose gratification lies in the domain of art and science, and moral desires which impel to righteousness. To this may be added the peculiar impulses arising from the consciousness of dependence upon a higher power and leading to religious worship.

In every soul there is a love of the beautiful and of the sublime and a desire for knowledge and truth. Although these sentiments do not exist in every person to the same degree and are not equally developed in all, the fact of their

existence is beyond dispute. We may appeal to them with the same assurance that we are addressing ourselves to the nature of man as when our appeal is made to the animal appetites. That the taste of some is bad, and that the love of truth in some is low, we do not question. But no one prefers ugliness to beauty as he cognizes beauty, and no one prefers falsehood as such to the truth. It is indeed undeniable that the higher spiritual truth is hated of men as they are by nature since the fall. Of this the Scriptures certify us. But those who hate the truth and love a lie are never said in the abstract to give falsehood the preference. It is the truth in Jesus to which the human heart is averse, because this truth, regarded materially, conflicts with the natural propensities and desires of sinful man. Formally considered the truth is still preferred. If the Gospel were false, its contents would still be hateful to the carnal mind. Error is not preferred because it is error, but because the matter which it contains is more in accord with natural inclination. Other things being equal, men intellectually give the preference to truth. Nor is the prevailing disinclination among men to devote themselves to severe study a proof that there is in their nature no love of knowledge. It only shows that the application necessary to secure it in the higher forms of thought is distasteful, and that the self-denial which its requisitions demand is a burden from which most persons shrink. If it were as easy to become learned as it is to remain ignorant, ignorance would soon be banished from the earth. All men desire knowledge, but most men desire other things more. The stronger desire which conflicts with the desire for knowledge prevents the retirement and labor necessary for the attainment of the latter. There is much that stands in the way of aesthetic and scientific impulse, and it is a misreading of human nature when the small number of those who are guided by them is assumed to be an evidence that they are adventitious. They belong to our nature and are capable of culture, Men who devote themselves to art and science have no other souls with other faculties than those which all men possess. Others have the same essential powers. Certainly not all have the same gifts. The degree of power in the imagination and reason is different in different persons. Some men whose

calling requires manual labor might accomplish but little in the domain of mental activity. But it is not impossible that men of the highest endowment for the latter should spend their lives in the former. The choice of occupation is under the government of God, and he arranges all things wisely. We would therefore not be understood as saying that there are many "mute inglorious Miltos" among those who remain all their life-long hewers of wood. The presumption always is that under the direction of Providence each talent finds its appropriate sphere of action. But it is still true that "many are poets who have never penned their inspirations," and many are philosophers who have never heard of Plato or of Kant. The capacity for aesthetic and intellectual impulses is in all men, and the proper discipline of the will must provide for their gratification according to the dictates of reason. Much is gained when those who are accustomed to sensual surroundings are brought under the influence of art and science. They may not become artists or scientists or philosophers, but they may have their attention averted from that which is low and base and directed to that which is lofty and noble. The will, when the surroundings are beautiful and true, will make its choice among these, as it makes its choice among the objects around when these are such as merely appeal to the sensual appetites. The advantage is great when people are elevated from gratifications that are animal to those which are rational.

But more still is accomplished when the will can be led to make its choice in the domain of the moral and religious. This is nobler than even that of the aesthetic and scientific. That morality does not consist in the action as such, but in the design with which it is performed, and that the moral sphere thus includes all others, does not conflict with our statement. A person may be virtuous alike in the gratification of his animal and of his aesthetic and scientific desires; he may sin against morality as well in the pursuit of the beautiful and the true as in sensual indulgence. There is no class of objects or of actions that as such constitute the domain of virtue. A person who eats and drinks to satisfy the wants of nature and denies himself the gratification of all impulses to excess is so far virtuous; a person who devotes

his life to the enjoyment of the beautiful merely as a selfish indulgence in that kind of pleasure, or who pursues knowledge as a means of self-aggrandizement, thus living for self to the exclusion of all service of love, is so far vicious. But that does not militate against the fact that there is such a thing as virtue and vice, and that it may be pursued as well as beauty or knowledge. The domain of morality is wider than that of the others; it in fact embraces all the others; but it is none the less a special category in which man's actions are to be contemplated. Nay, precisely because it stretches over the whole range of human conduct, is it a category in which all actions of intelligent beings must be contemplated. It pertains to the purpose with which any action is performed, whatever may be the domain within which that action lies. Whether we like it or dislike it, our designs and deeds will be judged according as they agree or disagree with that standard. And that category may and should be chosen as the more important and more worthy. Whether an act is right is of more moment to mankind than whether an act is necessary to preserve the life of the individual or the existence of the species. But it is also of more moment than the question whether it promotes art and science. Probably to intelligences that see clearly beauty and truth and righteousness are always coincident; but whether they seem so to us or not, righteousness must reign. That cannot be subordinated to the requirements of science and art, even though the interest of these should appear to demand such subordination. And the same must be said of the religious impulse. Our felt dependence upon a higher Being to whom we are accountable for all our mental and bodily actions is the basis of the moral feelings and judgments. What is due to our Maker and Preserver and Ruler and final Judge cannot be made of secondary import. We owe Him allegiance and worship, and if any desires, whether for animal gratification or for beauty and knowledge, comes in conflict with this obligation, the former, not the latter, must give way. We must serve God and do right at every hazard and at every sacrifice. This is not only the teaching of our Lord in Holy Scripture, that we should seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, but also the univer-

sal testimony of human consciousness. Before the forum of conscience no man can justify his rebellion against God, or his living contrary to the rule of right, by pleading the claims of the body or the demands of beauty or scientific truth. That which conflicts with religious or moral obligations cannot be in any sense good, and should not be regarded as desirable. The will should therefore be led to choose, first of all, in this category. That is to say, the mind should, in accordance with the universal testimony of human consciousness, be directed to view all actions in their relation to right and religion first.

The fact that man is a fallen creature, all of whose actions are tainted by the corruption which pervades his nature, does not militate against these statements. That man's actions in the moral and religious domain will be sinful, so long as the grace of God does not renew the depraved heart, is certainly true. But the same holds in every department of man's activity. The sinner can do nothing without sinning. His acts will be as he is himself. Whatsoever is not of faith is sin. No act emanating from the selfish soul that is held in bondage by sin can please God. In that respect no difference is to be made between acts in the sphere of sensuality, of art and science, of morality and religion. But that is not the only respect in which acts can be viewed. From the truth that all are alike sinful it does not follow that relatively all are of the same character and of the same value. Murder is worse than pilfering, and fratricide is worse than manslaughter; labor in a useful vocation is better than idling about and living at the expense of others; the enjoyment of beneficence is nobler than that of avarice. Men have always made such distinctions, and they can never cease to make them without doing violence to their nature. Moreover, it is true that in the highest domain of activity the evil is greatest. Idolatry is the chief offense against the decalogue. But just as it is an error to maintain that there should be no works of art, nor any other works, for that matter, because human nature is sinful and sins in whatever it does, so it is an error to maintain that there should be no moral and religious teaching and practice because all will be sinful at any rate. The ethics of heathen peoples lack that which is essential to

sound morality, and their religions are an abomination. But it is the best that nature can do, and the moral and religious sentiment must not be crushed because that best is bad. It must be educated. Self has a work to do in that regard. It cannot make itself moral and religious. God has made it so. But it can exercise such control over its surroundings and its attention as to give the moral and religious considerations the first place, and thus secure their prevalence over lower motives that clamor for precedence.

That the individual cannot secure this without extraneous aid we are well aware. Of course no attention can be paid to objects which are not at all brought within the domain of our knowledge. The choice is necessarily restricted to that which is placed before the intelligence. Much will therefore depend upon those with whom we have intercourse and who exercise an educating influence upon us, whether directly by precept or indirectly by example. The factors which enter into the discipline of the will are therefore the purposes of others as well as our own purposes, the former affecting our wills indirectly, the latter directly shaping our special volitions.

When we speak of the influence of the purposes of other persons in this connection, it will be readily observed that we make the distinction between self-discipline of the will and the discipline which it may receive through the influence of others. We may, indeed, exert an educating influence in turn upon those who are our educators. But so far as power is consciously exerted on others with the design of influencing the will and moulding the character, the object will not as a rule be ultimately our own self. In the nature of the case such influence on others with a view to reflex influence on self for its government is exceptional. What is thus affected is usually without previous purpose and design. The man who puts forth energies for his own self-control will not generally take the circuitous route of first endeavoring to direct others with a view to being subsequently directed by them. In itself this is not absurd. A person who has right impulses but consciously lacks decision of character, may exert his powers to lead his companions right, in order that these may in turn give him support in following his judgment

against his passions. But obviously the direct course of asserting the power of self against the inclinations and impulses of nature must be the rule. In exerting power over others, their education, not our own, will usually be the end in view. We help to mould others, as others help to mould us.

In this view the discipline of the will becomes an important element in education. As the moral is by common consent of a higher order than the scientific and the aesthetic, as these in turn are of greater moment than the animal, all judicious plans of education will be arranged with a view to the attainment of the higher ends. That will not exclude the gratification of other desires, so far as they present real wants of our nature. The animal appetites are in no danger of being overlooked. As they are instinctive, they will make themselves known and insist upon the necessary supplies. The danger here is excess, not insufficiency. There is therefore nothing further requisite in this respect than due care that they be not indulged overmuch and that they be not allowed to gain the ascendancy over those which are nobler. The aesthetic may be slighted in favor of the animal, and therefore this requires more attention. The young should be taught to admire the beautiful and the sublime in nature and art. While the supply of that which is necessary for our bodily life does not require any special exercise of volition to bring it to our attention, because a wise Providence has made these appetites instinctive and thus always clamorous for the requisite supplies, the desire of beauty, being less loud and more modest, because its gratification is not necessary to sustain life, but only to promote its happiness, may be unduly set aside. That bread is more needful than music or sculpture, than poetry or painting, especially as the natural desire in this regard can be gratified in the beauty and sublimity which nature presents to the imagination, no one can doubt. If the question be whether we shall, when hungry, enjoy a poem or a potato, the choice will universally fall upon the latter, although few would be ready on that account to place the vegetable absolutely above the work of art. The wants of the body must be satisfied in order to preserve life. Aesthetic enjoyments are in that respect secondary. But they

are so only in that respect. The appetites often cry for gratification after the wants of nature are supplied. Then the question arises whether luxuries for the sense should be supplied rather than that which satisfies the aesthetic wants of our souls. The decisive principle is that all the demands of our nature should be regarded. None should be slighted, none should be pampered. When that which is needed to sustain life is obtained, the attention should be directed to the supply of wants which, because they pertain to higher faculties, are nobler in their nature. Music and poetry and painting are preferable to wines and pastries and confections. If we cannot have both, the former should be secured to the exclusion of the latter; if we cannot have the latter to the desired extent without depriving ourselves of the former, self-denial is necessary in regard to the sensual appetite in favor of the aesthetic taste. The same principle applies in regard to the desire for knowledge. It is folly to starve the intellect in order to pamper the sensual appetite. Even the pleasures of taste must give way to the thirst for knowledge, because the gratification of this not only affords pleasures, but supplies us with that which is useful in furnishing supplies for all the other wants of our nature. Knowledge gives us control over the various forces in nature by making us acquainted with the laws according to which they operate, thus aiding in the supply of our physical wants; it enlarges our view in the domain of the beautiful, and thus increases the area of choice, whilst it refines the taste and thus contributes towards making the choice accordant with higher ideals; it suggests wider views of moral ends and furnishes new materials for their accomplishment, thus promoting morality by thrusting moral aspects upon the attention and facilitating the securement of that which conscience requires. That this latter aspect should always be made prominent in the teaching imparted to others is recognized by all men that have not been spoiled by vain theories. If the question arises whether right shall be done or knowledge secured, or taste gratified, or animal desire satiated, there can be no hesitation in deciding. People should be taught to do right, through every want of our nature else should remain ungratified. Education thus becomes an important factor in ennobling man, whose ten-

dency is to indulgence of appetite to the neglect of all the higher impulses. That man cannot thus be rendered holy need not be mentioned to those who know the Scriptures and know themselves. But that is not here the subject of inquiry. The will can be disciplined in the direction of the high and the noble in our nature, notwithstanding that our nature, even in its nobler powers, is depraved; and in that respect education is an important element in human improvements. It will never render a person otherwise than carnal; that is in our nature and cannot be eradicated by human power; but it can elevate the carnal mind by developing the powers that are nobler and securing to these the ascendancy. The man devoted to art and science is superior to the man devoted to eating and drinking, even if both are ungodly.

In this spirit self may discipline the personal will. The necessary effect of objects of knowledge and desire upon the soul may be utilized. The area of freedom in making choice may thus be determined by specific volitions made in accordance with generic volitions in governing purposes. The education which we receive and the culture which arises from self-application will direct us in this. The person who is trained to admire art and science will not, in determining his choice, ignore this domain. The person who is led to appreciate virtue will not, in exercising his power of volition, entirely overlook the claims of righteousness. He may be overmastered by sensual desires; he may be induced to choose some governing principle that sets aside higher claims; but he will not be likely entirely to overlook the things that are noble. He is not ignorant of them and cannot render himself ignorant of them. They will sometimes, through the power of conscience, assert themselves in his soul. He is master, and his mastery may declare itself through the will. He can choose the governing purpose, and if he be trained in the way of virtue the governing purpose will be to do the right. In this respect the education given in youth is decisive. "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it." Prov. 22, 6. In this sense "the child is father to the man." But even when the proper education has been neglected in youth, there may be a self-education that will secure nobler purposes. When we have learned, whether

by reflection or by reading, to appreciate the relative value and dignity of the various powers of the soul, we may choose the nobler as the guide of life, and subordinate the others in the order of their worth. This will form the governing purpose of our life. All special volitions will, as a rule, be directed by this. We say that this will be the rule, not that all volitions will be in absolute conformity to the purpose. There will always be desultory volitions in disharmony with the rule. The artist or philosopher may sink into acts of animal excess; the virtuous man may fall into deeds of evil; but while the governing purpose remains, the philosopher will return to his search for truth, the righteous man to his love of virtue. In that path they will walk, and all deviations will be exceptions. The will may be trained to choose the highest of these categories as that by which the life is to be gauged; and when the choice is made, self may be habituated to assert itself in volitions that accord with it and in the refusal to put forth volitions that conflict with it, however strong may be the appeal of lower elements in our nature. Such decision of character is the result of a wise discipline of the will, by which a strict guard is kept over the passions, and self habitually asserts its supremacy by its persistency in choosing that which commands itself to the judgment as adapted to the end. Whether such a character is noble or base will depend upon right judgment in determining the relative value of the various powers of the soul and their gratification and the generic volition which forms the governing purpose or leading principle of action.

By exercising such discipline men have even in heathendom reached moral heights that render them the admiration of all ages. Man is fallen, but he has remained man. He still retains all the faculties of that immortal soul with which he was originally endowed, though sin has corrupted them all. These faculties, notwithstanding their sinfulness, are capable of a high degree of culture. This appears probable from the nature of these faculties; this is rendered certain by the history of mankind. So elevated have been the thoughts and sentiments of some men, so noble have been their lives, that some have even failed to see the fundamental difference between such lofty characters among heathens and

the humble disciples of Jesus. Such an error is radical and fraught with the direst consequences. But it cannot be remedied by the effort to substitute for it the other error that man has ceased to be a living soul endowed with high powers of intellect and sensibility and will. These powers corrupted are still in essence the same. Thought is still thought and sentiment is still sentiment. The intelligent creature still has the power superior to the brute. And intelligence and rational feeling still rank higher in man than animal appetite. Socrates is a nobler character than Nero. There is something gained when an interest in art can be awakened in the sot, or a zeal for knowledge can be excited in a debauchee. There is something gained when high talent can be rendered subservient to moral instead of wicked ends. Man is not thus delivered from the depravity of his nature; he is not saved by such a discipline of the will; but he is thus lifted to a higher level, and life on earth does thus become more tolerable.

L.

CONFESSTION CONCERNING SOME CONTROVERTED POINTS OF DOCTRINE.

Following this is "The Confession" which Dr. Schmidt of the Norwegian Synod and his friends have presented at the pastoral conference lately convening in Decorah, Iowa, and in which "Confession" these our brethren set forth their faith concerning the doctrine of election, etc. The translation of it is by Mr. A. Huus of our Seminary. According to "Altes und Neues" of November 15, 1884, the Confession now has 73 signatures, among whom there are 4 Professors in the employ of the Norwegian Synod. For an historical introduction to this Confession, the reader is referred to the Article of Prof. Stellhorn in the last number of this Magazine.

C. H. L. S.

A.—CONCERNING ELECTION.

We confess as the doctrine of the Word of God concerning election to the infallible attainment of eternal salvation:

- a) What Dr. E. Pontoppidan teaches in question 548.

"Sandhed til Gudfrygtighed," as follows: "What is election? That God has ordained all those to eternal life of whom he from eternity foresaw that they would accept the proffered grace, believe in Christ, and in this faith remain steadfast unto the end."

b) What the Form. of Conc. teaches Part II, Art. XI, § 18, namely, that God in His purpose and counsel has decreed "That all those who, in true repentance receive Christ by a true faith He would justify and receive into grace, adoption and inheritance of eternal life." Form. of Concord, P. I, Art. XI, § 18: "In Him, therefore, we should seek the eternal election of the Father, who, in His eternal divine counsel, determined that He would save no one except those who acknowledge His Son, Christ, and truly believe on Him."

c) What John Gerhard teaches, Loci Theol. X, Chap. IX, Intuitum fidei ingredi electionis decretum, § 161: "The merit of Christ is the cause of our election. But, since the merit of Christ does not benefit any one without faith, we therefore say, that (God's) consideration of faith must also be included in the decree of election. With a loud voice we confess that we teach that God has found nothing good in that man who should be elected to eternal life, that he has taken into consideration, neither good works, nor the use of the free will, yea, what is more, not even faith itself in such a way that either being induced by these, or on account of them, he has elected some. But we say that it is the merits of Christ alone whose worthiness God has taken into consideration, and that He has formed the decree of election out of pure grace.

Yet, since the merit of Christ is not to be found in man without faith, we therefore teach that election has taken place in consideration of the merit of Christ which in the future would be apprehended by faith. We therefore say that all those, and only those, are by God from eternity elected to salvation, concerning whom He has foreseen that they, by the operation of the Holy Spirit, by the ministry of the Gospel, would in truth believe in Christ the Redeemer, and remain steadfast in faith unto the end of life." And Dispo. Isag. page 711: "We say that the moving cause of election is the merit of Christ, apprehended by faith. The meaning

is this: God has by no means by an absolute grace predestined some to eternal life, and, by an absolute hatred rejected others to eternal death. Nor has He, on account of their own merits, predestined some to life; but, in His eternal decree of election He has only taken into consideration the perfect and satisfactory merit of His Son, whereby He permitted Himself to be induced to elect some to eternal life, namely, all those, and only those, concerning whom He foresaw that they would by faith apprehend the merit of Christ, and in this faith remain steadfast unto the end. Concerning whom He, on the contrary, foresaw that they would not accept His merit, but continue in impenitence and unbelief unto the end, these He has rejected. For the merit of Christ is regarded in the decree of election not only with regard to its acquisition by Christ, in which respect it pertains to all men, but also with regard to its appropriation, in so far as it is apprehended by a true and steadfast faith. From this it may be seen that the internal moving cause of election is not the merit of Christ in itself, or considered without its appropriation, but the merit of Christ apprehended by faith."

We reject as false doctrine "The Reformed doctrine concerning election, in consequence of which God has, without respect to the belief or unbelief of man, from eternity appointed some to eternal life, and others to eternal death,—a doctrine which is well adapted to lead man either to carnal security or to despair." (Minutes of Norwegian Synod, 1869, page 73.) At the same time that we declare that he teaches correctly who says that God, in His eternal election of those who will infallibly obtain eternal salvation, has permitted Himself to be influenced only by His grace and the merit of His Son, Jesus Christ, at the same time we declare that He teaches falsely who wants to explain this thus, that God, when He made His decree of election, did not take into consideration, in how far this merit of His Son Jesus Christ, would be apprehended in a true conversion, by a living faith.

B.—CONCERNING THE CALL.

We, furthermore, confess as the doctrine of the Word of God,

a) What E. Pontoppidan says in question 478 of "Sandhed til Gudfrygtighed," as follows: "What is the call of God?

that by His Word he moves the hearts of men, and especially by the Gospel reveals His grace to them, earnestly offering it and, at the same time, giving power to accept it." 2 Tim. 1, 9.

b) What the Form. of Conc. teaches (P. I, Art. XI, § 8): "Thus Christ calls to Himself all sinners, and promises them rest, and He is anxious that all men should come to Him and permit Him to help them. To them He offers Himself in His Word, and wishes them to hear it, and not to stop their ears or (neglect and) despise the Word. He promises besides the power and efficiency of the Holy Ghost, and divine assistance for perseverance and eternal salvation" P. II, Art. XI, § 29, as follows: "Therefore it is Christ's command that to all in common to whom repentance is preached this promise of the Gospel also should be offered. Luke 24, 47; Mark 16, 15.

And this call of God, which is made through the preaching of the Word, we should regard as no delusion, but know that thereby God reveals His will, viz. that in those whom He thus calls He will work through the Word, that they may be enlightened, converted and saved. For the Word, whereby we are called, is a "ministration of the Spirit," that gives the Spirit, or whereby the Spirit is given (2 Cor. 3, 8), and "a power of God unto salvation." Rom. 1, 16. "And since the Holy Ghost wishes to be efficacious through the Word, and to strengthen and give power and ability, it is God's will that we should receive the Word, believe and obey it" 33. "With this revealed will of God we should concern ourselves, and should follow and study it, because the Holy Ghost, through the Word whereby He calls us, bestows to this end grace, power and ability, and we should not attempt to scrutinize the abyss of God's hidden predestination as it is written in Luke 13, 24."

We reject as false the doctrine that God the Holy Ghost, through the Word whereby He calls men, does not bestow on all these men whom He calls, and every one of them, grace, power and ability to convert themselves to God and to believe in Christ.

C.—CONCERNING CONVERSION.

We, furthermore, confess as the doctrine of the Word of God,

a) What the Form. of Conc. teaches (P. II, Art. II, § 18), namely, "that the free will, from its own natural powers, not only cannot work or co-work as to any thing for its own conversion, righteousness and salvation, or follow, believe or assent to the Holy Ghost, who through the Gospel offers him grace and salvation, but rather from its innate, wicked, perverse nature, it hostilely resists God and His will, unless it be enlightened and controlled by God's Spirit." 2 Cor. 3, 5; 1 Cor. 2, 14; Rom. 8, 7.

b) What the Form. of Conc. teaches (P. II, Art. II, § 49): "It is not God's will that any one should perish, but that all men should be converted to him and be saved eternally. Ez. 33, 4. John 3, 16. Therefore God, out of his immense goodness and mercy, causes His divine eternal Law and His wonderful plan concerning our redemption, namely, the holy, only saving Gospel of His dear Son, our only Savior and Redeemer, to be publicly proclaimed; and by this (preaching) collects for Himself from the human race an eternal Church, and works in the hearts of men true repentance and knowledge of sins, and true faith in the Son of God, Jesus Christ. And by these means and in no other way, namely, through His holy Word, when it is heard as preached or read, and the holy Sacraments when they are used according to the Word, God desires to call men to eternal salvation, to draw them to Himself, and to convert, regenerate and sanctify them. 1 Cor. 1, 21; Acts 11, 14; Rom. 10, 17; John 17, 17. 20. Therefore the eternal Father calls down from heaven, concerning His dear Son, and concerning all who, in His name, preach repentance and forgiveness of sins: "Hear ye Him" (Matt. 17, 5). This preaching (of God's Word) all who wish to be saved ought to hear. For the preaching and hearing of God's Word are instruments of the Holy Ghost, by, with and through which he desires to work efficaciously, and to convert men to God, and to work in them both to will and to do."

c) What the Form. of Conc. teaches (P. II, Art. 53): "This Word man can externally hear and read, even though he be not yet converted to God and regenerate; for in these external things, as above said, man, even since the fall, has to a certain extent a free will, so that he can go to church and hear or not hear the sermon. Although now both,

viz. the planting and watering of the preacher, and the running and willing of the hearer, would be to no purpose, and no conversion would follow, if the power and efficacy of the Holy Ghost were not added thereto, who, through the Word preached and heard, enlightens and converts the hearts, so that men believe this Word and assent thereto; nevertheless neither preacher nor hearer should doubt this grace and efficacy of the Holy Ghost, but should be certain, if the Word of God is preached freely and clearly, according to the command and will of God, and men listen attentively and earnestly, and meditate upon it, that God is certainly present with His grace, and grants, as has been said, what man can otherwise from his own powers neither accept nor give. (72.) This doctrine also directs us to the means whereby the Holy Ghost desires to begin and work this (which we have mentioned), instructs us how those gifts are preserved, strengthened and increased, and admonishes us that we should not receive this grace of God in vain, but diligently ponder how grievous a sin it is to hinder and resist such operations of the Holy Ghost."

Furthermore, what Mart. Chemnitz teaches (Postil XX after Trinity): "According to the Scriptures we can and must not judge otherwise than that it is the will of God, when He brings us His Word, that He will thereby be efficacious in us, and effect, that by His gift, power and operation, we can accept the proffered grace. But the natural wickedness of the flesh can also resist such operation of God."

Likewise what John Musaeus teaches (Concerning Election, p. 263): "Man can undoubtedly not convert himself, and of himself and of his own power believe; but yet he can do it by the grace of God, which is present to him to work conversion and faith by the Word itself, which commands them to convert themselves and believe. Consequently Christ wills by those words of command (Repent and believe) that sinners shall convert themselves and believe, yet not by the natural powers, which is an impossibility, but by grace."

d) What Dr. E. Pontoppidan teaches (Summary of Doctrine § 31): "Whoever does not resist the grace of the Holy Ghost, but allows himself to be lead into this order of salva-

tion, is awakened from his spiritual death, is born again unto a new life, regains again the lost image of God, new light in the understanding, new desire and power in the will, a change of mind and heart."

Furthermore, what Polycarp Leyser teaches (against Huber, p. 22): "When the Holy Ghost by the Word offers men the grace of God, and begins to work in them, they have still a *capacitas passiva* (as the Book of Concord calls it), that is, they are not as a stick or stone, but they can by the grace of God receive the gracious, efficient working of the Holy Ghost. And they who thus permit God to accomplish His work in them, receive faith, and through faith the grace of God, and together with this also the adoption or election to adoption with God." Rom. 8. Eph. 1. "And these do not thus bring about that God is gracious or performs a work of grace (as Huber accuses us of teaching), but by the operation of the Holy Ghost, they only receive the grace of God and accept the action of grace."

Finally what Joh. Micraelius teaches (Concerning Predestination, p. 435): "That grace, which by regeneration transfers man from death to life does not in an irresistible manner determine the will. For, although man in spiritually good things has not a free will, he still has the ability to remain in the evil, and thus to resist the grace. Nor is he converted as a stone, but as a man, who is endowed with reason and will. Therefore, when he, under the external guidance while the Word is preached to him, hears it, ponders over it, and searches it, as the Chamberlain of Ethiopea, then will the Holy Ghost kindle faith in him, not however, by powers which he finds in man, but by powers which he communicates."

e) What the Form. of Conc. teaches (P. II, Art. II, § 58): "But where such a man despises the instrument of the Holy Ghost, and will not hear, no injustice befalls him if the Holy Ghost do not enlighten him, but he be allowed to remain in the darkness of his unbelief, and to perish; for of this it is written (Matt. 23, 37): How often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!" Furthermore (P. I, Art. XI, § 12): "That, however, many are called, few are chosen, does

not mean that God is unwilling that all should be saved, but the reason is that they either do not at all hear God's Word, but wilfully despise it, close their ears and harden their hearts, and in this manner foreclose the ordinary way to the Holy Ghost, so that He cannot effect His work in them, or, when it is heard, they consider it of no account, and do not heed it. For this (that they perish) not God or His election, but their wickedness, is responsible. 2 Pet. 2, 1 sq.; Luke 11, 49, 52; Heb. 12, 25 sq.; Luke 7, 30. Furthermore (P. II, Art. II, § 60): "And although God does not force man to become godly, for those who always resist the Holy Ghost and persistently oppose the known truth, as Stephan says of the hardened Jews (Acts 7, 51), will not be converted. And § 83; And indeed all those who obstinately and persistently resist the operations and movements of the Holy Ghost, which take place through the Word, do not receive, but grieve and lose the Holy Ghost."

Furthermore what Pontoppidan teaches (Summary of Doctrine, § 42): "But he who will not receive and use the grace of God, according to this plan of salvation, he remain in his natural state of sin, seperated from God, and must expect part with the devil and his angels in eternal condemnation."

Furthermore, what G. Mylius teaches (Disputations 11, 136): "That many are not in possession of faith, is not so because God begrudges them this or denies it to them, but because they themselves do not want it. For they could have believed, if they had wanted to, since they could have performed that whereby God undoubtedly would have granted also them faith, if they had not obstinately resisted the Holy Ghost, but had been willing to follow the example of the people of Berea, and diligently search the Scriptures and ponder the word of the Gospel."

Finally what F. Balduin teaches (concerning the Articles of Visitation, 11, 68): That so many of those who are called are without faith in Christ is certainly not from this cause that God begrudges them faith or denies it to them, but because they themselves do not want it. For they could have believed, had they desired it, since they could very easily have done all that whereby God promised to grant faith, and

had they done that, then He would undoubtedly, since He rejects no one that comes to Him, have given also them faith, provided they had not obstinately resisted the Holy Ghost, when He began to work in them."

f) What the Eastern District of our Synod expressed in 1879 (Minutes, page 45): "When this powerful, awakening call of grace of the Holy Ghost comes, it will depend on the conduct of man over against the same whether or not it shall reach its aim. Man has the ability to resist the call, to close his ears to the awakening voice. Yea, thus the greatest number conduct themselves."—Furthermore, what *Dr. Walther* previously taught (Postil, page 93): "Although all men by nature are equally sinful, and God first must remove their resistance, yet no one will on that account perish; for when God comes with His Word, He also comes with His Holy Ghost, and desires to remove the natural resistance. But he who then does not only put his natural resistance against the working of the Holy Ghost, but also obstinately and persistantly resists, him even God Himself cannot help. For God will force no one to conversion; a forced conversion is no conversion at all."

Furthermore, what *Pastor V. Koren* formerly taught (Minutes of Synod for 1872, page 33, Thesis 52): "A distinction must be made between a natural want of the will (unwillingness) to follow the call, and a deliberate will not to follow it. The former is the natural resistance, which is common to all; the latter is a real obstinacy and a rejection of the call."

We reject as false doctrine:

a) "The doctrine of the Synergists who pretend that man is not absolutely dead to good in spiritual things, but is badly wounded and half dead. Therefore, although the free will is too weak to make a beginning, and by its own powers to convert itself to God, and to be obedient in heart to God's Son; nevertheless when the Holy Ghost makes a beginning, and calls us through the Gospel, and offers His grace, the forgiveness of sins and eternal salvation, that then the free will, from its own natural powers, meets God, and to a certain extent, although feebly, can act, help and co-operate thereto, can qualify itself for, and apply itself to grace, and embrace and accept it, and believe the Gospel, and also, in the progress and support of this work, it can co-operate by its own powers,

with the Holy Ghost. But, on the contrary, it has above been shown at length that such power, namely, the facultas applicandi se ad gratiam, i. e. to qualify one's self from nature for grace, does not proceed from our own natural powers, but alone from the operation of the Holy Ghost." (Compare Form. of Conc., P. II, Art. II, §§. 77 and 78).

b) The doctrine which is expressed in the following thesis: "Reason can certainly not reconcile this: On the one hand, God says that He is gracious toward all, and that He earnestly wills the salvation of all men; but, on the other hand, He also lays claim to a full and unlimited right to have mercy on whom He wills, and to harden whom He will. And experience also establishes that from many millions of men He does not take away their resistance, which He could as easily remove as in the elect, since they by nature are equally corrupt, and these are by nature no better than the others. When we regard God thus, He is undoubtedly for us a hidden and incomprehensible God."

D.—CONCERNING PRESERVATION.

Furthermore, we confess as the doctrine of the Word of God what the Form. of Conc. says (P. II, Art. XI, 32 and 33): "Thus, also, Holy Scripture shows that God, who has called us, is so faithful, when He has begun a good work in us, that He also will preserve and continue it to the end, if we do not turn ourselves from Him, but retain firmly to the end the work begun for retaining which He has promised His grace." (1 Cor. 1, 9; Phil. 1, 6; 1 Pet. 5, 10; 2 Pet. 3, 9; Heb. 3, 2).

We reject as false the doctrine that God should have given an unconditional promise concerning the infallible attainment of eternal salvation, that is, a promise which did not involve this condition: If you convert yourself, if you believe in Christ, if you remain steadfast in the faith in Christ unto the end.

E.—CONCERNING THE CERTAINTY.

Furthermore we confess as the doctrine of the Word of God:

a) What is taught in "Sandhed til Gudfrygtighed" of E. Pontoppidan, question 759: "Can he be certain of a happy

death, who thus believes and lives in the fellowship of Jesus? Yes; he is certainly a child of God and an heir of heaven; and in "Epitome of Dr. E. Pontoppidan's Explanation of M. Luther's Catechism," question 602: "Can he be certain of a happy death, who thus believes in the fellowship of Jesus? Yes; if he remain steadfast in the faith until death."

b) What is taught in the Form. of Conc. (P. II, Art. XI, 70): "Therefore no one who would be saved should trouble or harass himself with thoughts concerning the secret counsel of God, as to whether he also is elected and ordained to eternal life; for with these miserable thoughts Satan is accustomed to attack and annoy godly hearts. But they should hear Christ (and in Him look upon the Book of life in which is written the eternal election of all God's children to eternal life; who testifies to all men without distinction that it is God's will that all men who labor and are heavy laden with sin should come to Him in order that He may give them rest and save them."

We reject as false doctrine:

- 1) When it is claimed that a conditional certainty concerning future salvation is no certainty at all.
- 2) When it is taught that all believers, even those who do not remain steadfast in faith unto the end, both according to the will of God *shall*, and by the working of His Spirit of Truth *can*, by Christian faith, which according to its essence never fails, be unconditionally certain that they are elected to the infallible attainment of eternal salvation.

THE CHARACTER OF THE OLD TESTAMENT COVENANT.

The Old Testament is not an accidental collection of the literary remains of the Israelites in the sense in which we have an Indian, a Greek or a Latin literature. In its highest and truest conception, it is a revelation and the history of a revelation. Its chief virtue does not consist in its ability to furnish us the data for a clear idea of the intellectual and political development of the most interesting member in the

oriental family of nations; but its prime object is to hand down to us the revelations of God, through word and deed, designed to show fallen man the way back to reconciliation with God and restoration to a lost estate, as also to show how this revelation took historic form and growth in the development of that nation which the Lord had chosen to be bearers of its truths. In other words, the chief burden and central thought of the Old Testament is the plan of redemption adopted by Jehovah and to be inaugurated and developed by means of a covenant with His own peculiar people. More particularly then, the covenant between Jehovah and His people is the pivot around which all the other thoughts and facts of the Old Testament circle, and in relation to which they find their importance and mission. Such is certainly the view entertained by Christ and His apostles concerning the character of the Old Testament canon, and the Savior with His revelation knew Himself to be in the most intimate connection with that of Moses and the prophets. To regard these books then as literary productions in the ordinary sense of the word, as this is done by Wellhausen and his school, may be "scientific," but it is unhistorical and false. In fact this fundamental error is the *πρᾶτον φεῦδος* of the new critical school. As they expel God from Israel, they eliminate the divine element from his revelation.*

Since God in the Old Testament dispensation is working out His plan for the salvation of mankind through His covenant with Israel and since the Old Testament revelation is the record of this covenant from its inception to its transition into another state through Christ, the character of this covenant will naturally be a matter of the greatest importance for the student of God's Word. Manifestly Old Testament Theology has no profounder theme than the elucidation of the character and nature of this covenant and its bearing and influence upon the whole spiritual, religious and social life of those who lived under it, as also its connection with

* Kuenen, *De Godsdienst*, I, 5 sqq., in defining his standpoint, says: "Of the different religions, that of Israel is one; nothing less, but also nothing more." "Judaism and Christianity belong to the leading religions, but between these two and all other religions there exists no specific difference."

the covenant of the New Testament as established by Christ. No problem in the Old Testament can surpass in importance the one concerning this covenant, concerning God's commands and behests within the relationship it established, the conditions of citizenship it imposed, its stage of development, the principles which guided the Lord of the covenant in his dealings with the people, or, in other words, the ground of righteousness and acceptance before God under it, the basis of justification and the foundation of hope in the hearts of the faithful, in short, the whole nature, aim and object of this peculiar relation between God and Israel.

A brief exposition of this point may not be without a good purpose, not only on account of the intrinsic importance of the problem, but also because erroneous views are frequently entertained in respect to it. Not only is this done by negative critics who frequently build their fantastic hypotheses on a false conception of the religion of Israel, but also by devout believers. The notion is not infrequently expressed, and still more frequently implied, that the basis of the Old Covenant, is its accompanying legal feature, or, what is termed by some, Mosaism; that the righteousness demanded and taught by the Old Testament is a legal righteousness; that it demanded such a strict compliance with the minutiae of the Mosaic code as would make a sinner just and acceptable in the sight of God; or, in other words, that the principle of righteousness in the old dispensation was a righteousness through the works of the law, and that the faithful, in order to be just before the Lord within this covenant, had to earn this by obedience. This is the view of those who find in the Old Testament only law, but no gospel; only condemnation, but no grace and pardon. It precedes from the premises that "Mosaism" is identical with the Old Covenant and the Old Covenant with "Mosaism." No error could do greater violence to the essence and spirit of the Old Covenant than this identification. "Mosaism" is *not* the Old Covenant, nor is the Old Covenant "Mosaism." The error of indentifying the two and making obedience to the law of Sinai the basis of righteousness and justification in the pre-Christian dispensation undoubtedly arises from a misconception of Christ's and Paul's attitude toward the law.

Their explicit and emphatic rejection of all legal righteousness and decided vindication, over against this principle, of a justification by faith alone, are frequently considered as polemics against the law and its principles as such. In reality, however, both the Savior and the great Apostles, as indeed the whole New Testament, contends for the truth of the new dispensation not over against an error of the Old, but only against an erroneous interpretation of the Old. The theology of the schools in Israel in Christ's days, as this was taught by the Pharisees, who can fairly be considered as the representatives of the popular beliefs of the times, did certainly teach the doctrine of legal righteousness and holiness. That they had deserted the true basis of righteousness in the kingdom of God and substituted in its place a self-righteousness through an obedience to the law is very evident from Christ's scathing condemnation of their doctrines. Their teachings are the leaven of unrighteousness because they teach a false righteousness. It is true that in his polemics against the popular teachers of the day, Christ does not give a systematic statement of their false views, but we need only to glance at such passages as Matt. 15, 1 sqq., 16, 6 sqq. and read the woes pronounced in Matt. 23, 13 sqq. to recognize that they are ὁδηγοὶ τυφλοὶ τυφλῶν (Matt. 15, 14) because they proclaim a legal and self-righteousness. Paul's repeated and emphatic elucidations of the doctrine of justification by faith alone, with the avowed and entire exclusion of all righteousness by any self-merit or work of the law, is to be attributed to the fact that the whole Jewish theology of the times was entirely permeated by this fatal error. How thoroughly this was the case is apparent from the doctrines laid down in the official records of the Jewish faith, the Talmud, Targum and Midrash. Although the codification of these does not reach up to the apostolic era, yet in their fundamentals they are without doubt correct representations of the beliefs entertained by Christ's contemporaries. And if any principle is plainly taught in these works it is the doctrine of righteousness before God solely and alone through the works of the law. The public teachers of the day maintained the nomistic principle in all its crudest outgrowths.*

* The most satisfactory and exhaustive work on this subject is that

While they sat on Moses' seat (Matt. 23, 2) they did not teach Moses' doctrine. For that their conception and interpretation of the Old Testament was erroneous *in toto* is evident from the steady opposition of New Testament teachers and teachings. Indeed the very reason why they so bitterly antagonized the Savior and His work, and He so terribly denounced them was because between their doctrines there was an impossible gulf, because the basis and fundamental thesis of their whole system, namely that entrance into the kingdom of God and acceptance before the Lord who had made a covenant with Israel was dependent upon a righteousness conditioned by an obedience to the Mosaic code and the traditions of the fathers, was totally and fatally false. They were not correct exponents of the teachings and spirit of the Old Testament. Christ, who came with the full consciousness of standing in a living connection with the past revelation in the kingdom of God, finds this revelation misinterpreted and falsified by the leaders in Israel. This is why He contends against them. He came not to overthrow the Old Covenant, but to fulfill it; and just in so far as the teachers of the people differed from Him, in so far too they had departed from the truth of the covenant and set up error.

If then the views of Christ's contemporaries are a false expression of the character and spirit of the Old Testament covenant, and if the righteousness which it demands is not the righteousness of the law, what then is its correct principle and what is the nature of the righteousness it calls for? To learn this the best method will probably be to view the Old Testament in the light of the New. Augustine, whose works abound in terse statements of great truths, says: "In Veteri Testamento Novum latet, in Novo Vetus patet."[†] The New Testament is the best exposition of the Old; Christ and the apostles are the best exegetes of Moses and the prophets. In

of the deceased pastor and missionary Weber, edited by Delitzsch and Schnedermann, and entitled "System der Altsynagogalen Palästinischen Theologie, aus Targum, Midrash und Talmud," 1880; and on the point under discussion the XIX chapter, p. 267 to 300 is to be compared. Excellent material, though more to show the genesis and the historical unfolding of the errors of New Testament Judaism, is furnished by Edersheim, in the Introductory chapter to his grand "Life of Jesus the Messiah." 1884.

[†] Quest. in Exod. 73.

its fulness of meaning the Old can be understood only in the light of the New. Biblical hermeneutics certainly teaches this. For however much critics may debate over the propriety of admitting the testimony of the Scriptures of the New Testament in the discussion of the *literary* problems of the Old, certainly every fair-minded Christian must instantly yield that for the *theological* study of the Bible no better aid can be found than the Bible itself. Let Scriptures interpret Scriptures, and it will always find acceptance among believers.[†] It will be best then to start investigation from the New Testament.

In regard to the question of the character of the Old dispensation and the righteousness and justification it taught, the New Testament *sedes doctrinae* are Romans c. 4 and Gal. 3, 6-14, where the apostle Paul explicitly and *ex professo* discusses this problem. The burden of Romans is the doctrine of justification by faith alone, without the deeds of the law. In the progress of his argument the logician Paul, in chapter 4, appeals to the earlier revelation and history of God's kingdom on earth to prove that the true righteousness before the Lord is the righteousness of faith alone. He here produces the scriptural, i. e. the Old Testament proof for his thesis. To prove his point he adduces the accounts given by the Old Testament of those two men who were undeniably the best representatives of the spirit and character of the covenant between God and Isrel, namely Abraham, the father of the faithful, and David, the man after God's own heart, and shows that according to these accounts they were justified before God not on account of any obedience to the law, but because they had faith in the promise of God. In other words, their righteousness was one of faith and not one of works. In v. 3 he cites the words of Gen. 15, 16 as conclusive in Abraham's case; and in v. 6-8 he adduces David's words in Ps. 32, 1, 2. to show that the great singer of the Old Covenant put his confidence

[†] This process in no wise is a violation of the historico-critical method of Biblical research, which correctly claims for a passage only that meaning which it was intended to convey at the time it was revealed, for whatever interpretation revelation gives to earlier revelation must evidently have been within the scope and intent of the latter. Studying the Old with the enlightened vision from the New Testament is not a false "*hysteron proteron*" exegesis.

and hope in God alone. The rest of the chapter is devoted to an elucidation, on the basis of O. T. citations, of Abraham's case, and the Apostle draws his conclusion in v. 22: "And therefore it (his faith) was imputed to him for righteousness." Abraham, then, the historical head, and as acknowledged by revelation and the author of revelation, the most faithful exponent of the Old Testament covenant, was justified because he had faith in the promises of God: he is, argues Paul on scriptural basis, as is also David, a convincing proof that also under the old dispensation acceptance before God or, what is the same, righteousness and justification, was based not upon merit or work, but upon faith alone.

The passage in Galatians is even clearer. The object of this epistle is to vindicate the great doctrine of justification by faith, which Paul had preached to the Galatian congregations but which Judaizing teachers had attempted to overthrow by maintaining that the Christians were yet bound to an observance of at least certain portions of the law. This gives the Apostle an opportunity of explaining the relation between the observance of the law and the nature of justification for those who had lived under it. In the course of his argumentation he gives in c. 3, 6-14 the scriptural proof that the Old Testament saints were justified, not because of their obedience to the law of Moses, but on account of their faith, again mentioning Abraham as a proof of this position and basing his argument on Old Testament citations. His conclusion is drawn in v. 11: "But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident: for, The just shall live by faith." Heb. 2, 14. Of course, as it is Paul, the defender of the doctrine of justification by faith alone, who employs this argument, the faith of Abraham must have been of the same character and had the same object which the faith demanded by the New Covenant has. Cf. also John 8, 56.

From both these passages it is evident that the Apostle Paul contends that faith in the words and promises of God or in Christ as the real contents of these promises is the *conditio sine qua non* for justification under the Old Covenant as it is under the New, and that as far as cardinal principles and fundamental character are concerned, there is no difference of

kind between the two dispensations. For in the nature of the case, it can admit of no doubt that what the Apostle here proves from the Old Testament records as having been true in the case of Abraham and David, is true also of the whole Old Covenant and of all who lived under it. For these two are true and correct representatives of the life and spirit of that covenant, and are acknowledged to be such by both revelation and history. The point proved in their case proves it for the whole old dispensation. Paul, as it were, in order to make assurance doubly sure, continues his argument and shows how these individual cases furnish the principles for the whole covenant, of which they were such representative examples. For the Abrahamic covenant is the Old Covenant; is the same covenant under which all the children of Abraham lived, and there is no indication of any sort in the records of later revelation that God ever changed, abrogated or recalled the conditions of justification which were in force in the case of Abraham. Paul is careful to prove this and to show that what is true in Abraham's case must be applicable also to the whole pre-Christian dispensation. The promise of grace once given to the father of the covenant and based upon faith, could not be, and was not changed. In Gal. 3, 17-18 this important truth for the understanding of the whole O. T. religion and history is clearly expressed: "And this I say, That the covenant, that was confirmed before God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise; but God gave it to Abraham by promise" (i. e. by faith). To paraphrase: The covenant existed before the law; this covenant conditioned, as is proved by Paul's exhaustive argument from Old Testament citations, justification and an acceptable status before God on the principle of faith; now when the law came, it could not change these cardinal principles of the covenant, as it was not the purpose of the law to supplant the existing covenant by a new one or to essentially change its character and conditions, but to be of service in making this covenant all the more effective. Thus then, argues the Apostle, even after the coming of the law, there was no change in the covenant relation between God and His people, and all later generations of Abraham's chil-

dren must be justified before God as was their father Abraham, namely by faith in Christ.* The Old Testament covenant does not begin at Mt. Sinai, but in Ur of the Chaldees, when Abraham was called to settle in Palestine (Gen. 12, 1-9). The Noahican covenant (Gen. 8, 15-9, 17) had proved an abortive attempt, and with the emigration of Abraham a new and important step was undertaken in the realization of God's plans for the redemption of mankind. Within him the covenant was established which later in history assumed the national form of a theocracy. The importance of Mt. Sinai and its law consists not in the overthrow of the old and the introduction of a new plan of Jehovah, but it was an epoch in the growth of this covenant, externally in its transfer from the family and individual to the national shape, and internally, and really resultant from the external change, by the giving of a law by which this national organization of God's people was to be governed and educated for their historical mission in the unfolding and development of the kingdom of God on earth until the fulness of time.

With this exposition of New Testament revelation to guide us, we will know where to begin an investigation of the nature and peculiarities of the Old Testament covenant, namely with the history of Abraham. After the deluge the Lord had promised to Noah (Gen. 8, 21, 22) that He would not again destroy mankind from the face of the earth on account of their sins. But the history of the sons of Noah, as far as knowledge and worship of the true God was concerned, was beginning to prove a repetition of the very same sinful development that had caused the dire destruction of the deluge to come over the descendants of Adam. In order then that the divine plans for the redemption and salvation of mankind might become a reality and fact, God selects

* The views expressed in these two places can fairly be regarded as the teachings of the whole New Testament, both directly and by implication. On Abraham's faith and justification consult also Kurtz, *Sacred History*, translated by Schaeffer, § 24-29. In Hebrews chap. 11 the power of faith in the saints and heroes of the old Testament is itemized *in extenso*. This chapter is not so much of an argumentative character and its facts are not cited by the author to prove a thesis, but it rather is illustrative and is to serve a parenetical purpose, belonging to the practical and exhortative part of the Epistle.

from among the children of Shem, who had comparatively speaking maintained the purest knowledge of God, one man, and with him begins a new development looking toward the successful realization of the ideals which had ever before proved a failure through the sins of men. The nature of this new development is that of a covenant between Jehovah and the chosen one, Abraham.* The germs of the principles of this covenant are contained already in the very first words addressed to Abraham by God (Gen. 12, 1-3), although the formal establishment of the covenant takes place some years later and is recorded in Genesis c. 15. The call to Abraham is recorded in these words: "And the Lord said to Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, into a land that I shall show thee: and I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing: and I will bless those that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." Here Jehovah promises great blessings to Abraham and to mankind in general, if Abraham will put his trust and confidence in Jehovah alone and follow His guidance. The condition under which Abraham is to be the recipient of the promised blessings is that he renounce all his trust in and allegiance with his earthly relations, country, family and home, and in absolute, and so-to-say blind adhesion to the Lord obey without faltering and hesitation the words of the Lord and go into a strange land knowing assuredly that Jehovah would make good His promises and redeem His pledges. The principle involved here is evidently the principle of faith: Abraham will prove acceptable before the Lord in case he has faith in the Lord's promises; or, to use the phraseology of later rendition, he was justified, and deemed righteous with God through his trust and faith.

What is here implied finds clear expression in the establishment of the covenant itself. That the events of chap. 15

* The etymology of the word berith, and whether it is originally the equivalent of διαθήκη or συνθήκη, i. e. whether it is originally meant simply a divine ordinance or an agreement between the contracting parties, is a matter of less moment for our purpose. Oehler, O. T. Theology § 80 and Gesenius, *Handwörterbuch* maintain the former; Bredenkamp, *Gesetz und Propheten*, p. 22. f., the latter.

are then to be considered as the formal conclusion of the covenant between God and the patriarch, is evident from v. 18: "In that same day the Lord made a covenant with Abram, saying. Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates." The Lord says: "Fear not, Abram: I am thy shield, and thy exceeding great reward."—When the patriarch complained that he was childless, the Lord tells him to go forth, and said: "Look now toward heaven, and tell the stars, if thou art able to number them. So shall thy seed be." Notwithstanding all the difficulties, or almost impossibilities in the way to an entertainment on the part of Abram of such a belief, the biblical records continue: "And he believed in the Lord; and He counted it to him for righteousness." Abram's part of the covenant then was faith; the result of this compliance with the conditions of the covenant was, that God counted it to him for righteousness. Abraham's reward, as promised by the Lord of the covenant, is the multiplication of his seed like the sand of the seashore and the possession of the land of promise. The kingdom of God on earth was then yet in its incipient stage of development and the promises are of such things as will form the basis for further growth and find consummation. But the higher and spiritual feature is not lacking, for in Abraham all the families of the earth are to be blessed.

Like all things in God's creation and God's kingdom, the covenant with Abraham was a growth. In c. 17, which records events at least fourteen years later than those of c. 15, the second stage of this covenant is depicted, and beside the re-announcement of the fundamental principles of the covenant, its sign, namely circumcision, is revealed to the patriarch, as also the theocratic lines of descent established through Isaac, the promised son of Abraham and Sarah. In this chapter, v. 1. Abraham's covenant duty is put in these words: "Walk before me, and be thou perfect," an injunction which presupposes and embraces in its compliance the confidence of faith which had been counted to Abraham for righteousness, and expresses rather the outward proof of the inward faith. The direct statements in the biblical account of Abraham as also the conduct of his life by the hand of Providence, especially

his willingness to sacrifice even the son of promise at the behest of the Lord, are all of such a character as to leave no doubt that the New Testament interpretation of the patriarch's relation to Jehovah is the correct one, and that he is the father of the faithful, because in his life he was the model exemplar of that faith, trust and confidence in the promises and providence of God which show that a theocracy (i. e. *θεός-χρηστεῖν*, a rule of God) had been established in his heart and thereby a God-pleasing relationship established between him and his God. This relation was such for no other reason than that he had faith in Jehovah, and that was the basis of this special covenant. Naturally this covenant relation is not developed in Abraham's case as it was in the time of the Prophets or under the new dispensation; but the cardinal principles and truths are there: it is a covenant of faith.

The account in Genesis show how in the case of both Isaac and Jacob the same covenant with the same conditions continued, with very little, if any, advance beyond the stage it had already reached, externally and internally, in the person of Abraham. As long as the covenant relation was an individual or a family relation, its primitive and embryonic status did not change, nor were the fundamental ideas developed by further revelation. We are not informed by the sacred records that the latter patriarchs were further instructed as to the character and nature of this faith in God's providential guidance, nor that any higher theological or ethical truths in this connection were made known to them. The accounts are chiefly of a simple, historical character and furnish us rather the data to judge of the life and workings of the Abrahamic covenant in the souls and minds of the chosen family. Nor have we even complete records of this status. It is a matter of considerable dispute among Old Testament students as to how much or how little the people of Israel had retained of the great truths of the covenant when Moses was sent to them with his message of deliverance. Based upon the interpretation or misinterpretation of some passages in the Prophets, some have endeavored to prove that Israel had sunk into a state of polytheism or idolatry of some character, and had lost all but the names of their patriarchs of faith; while others claim for the people considerable knowledge of

the truth. Be this as it may, revelation tells us that with Moses came an important change in the outward form of the covenant relation, the change from the family to the national form, and an inner change, the introduction of the law.

In the providence of God, the family of Jacob, under the bondage of aliens and strangers in the land of Egypt, developed into a compact people with strong national feelings and individuality probably more pronounced than would have been the case, if they had remained in the land of Canaan, amid tribes kindred in descent, language and customs, with whom it would have been but natural for the chosen family to associate and form alliances detrimental to their peculiar divine mission. When thus the nation had been born, Jehovah, through His chosen instrument Moses, effected the transfer of the theocracy from the family to the national form. The covenant relation and its fundamental character of faith as its distinguishing feature on man's part were to remain, but were to be made the possession of the people, of the nation as a whole. An epoch of such an importance in the unfolding of God's plans for man's redemption necessitated outward and inward steps of considerable magnitude. The outward step was the same as had been taken in the case of Abraham when the covenant was originally established, namely an election and selection from among the other nations of the earth and the establishment of a national life and rule in a particular country, where undisturbed by the examples and teachings of idolatrous neighbors, Israel could under the guidance and providence of God, work out its historical mission, both inwardly, as far as the knowledge, worship and recognition of God and His revelation were concerned, and outwardly, in developing, over against the Gentiles, who "were suffered to walk in their own ways" (Acts 14, 16), in visible form the kingdom of God on earth. With mighty arm Jehovah leads His people out of the land of bondage, and when they had been witnesses again and again of His power and His merciful protection, He, at Mt. Sinai, enters upon the covenant relation with them as a people. The motive in this particularism is the same as in the cases of both Abraham and Israel; namely outwardly to establish them in such surroundings that God

could accomplish His inner educational purpose within them. The rule of God, or the theocracy, in the individual now becomes such in a people. For that reason, they are to form one nation, separated entirely from all the rest, living in a land chosen for them and their historical mission by God Himself, and under His own personal rule and government. If the great plans of God were to be realized then such a separation and such a theocracy were a necessity, otherwise the attractions of sin could have thwarted the divine purposes.

The plans of God in Israel were the same as those He had in view in the case of the patriarchs, for the covenant He makes with the people is the same in principle and character, and is in fact identical with the one entered upon by Abraham and the other fathers. This identity is throughout the sacred words of Israel everywhere felt and expressed. God reveals himself to Moses as the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (Ex. 3, 6, and *passim*), and as such Jehovah is to be proclaimed to the people, and Moses is to inform them that now the time has come when the Lord will be about to redeem His promises given unto the patriarchs and will lead His people into the possession of the land flowing with milk and honey. But as these promises were given to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in virtue of the covenant of grace and faith existing between them and their God, this fulfillment of the promises on God's part is in itself already a sufficient testimony that the same covenant was still abiding and was to continue in the case of the people. There is not only not a syllable in all the revelations through Moses and in all the arrangements of Mosaism that points to a change or abrogation in the character of the covenant, but there is proof abundant, both expressed and implied, that before as after the covenant relation depended upon the faith and trust put by man in the promises and words of God.

The objective ground of this covenant, or the reason why God selects just Israel and no other people, to be the recipients of His special mercies is everywhere in the Pentateuch recognized to be the unmerited grace of Jehovah. Nowhere is there any intimation given that Israel was chosen on account of any special merit, but rather the very opposite,

the confession that Israel was entirely unworthy of this election, finds repeated expression. Especially is it in the book of Deuteronomy that this is the case. The Lord chose them because He *loved* them (Deut. 7, 7. 8; 8, 17). The mighty deeds of God in delivering the people from the hands of their oppressors, and of doing so without any merit or virtue on their part to deserve it, is a thought underlying not only all Mosaism but also all later revelation. He who fails to see this deep undercurrent of a confession of unworthiness of God's grace and the strong consciousness of sin in the whole Old Testament revelation, will never be able to understand the pre-Christian revelation. Mosaism knows nothing of self-righteousness, but acknowledges itself as the constant recipient of undeserved mercies on God's hands. This idea, which necessarily lies at the bottom of and is presupposed in a covenant of grace, finds a much clearer expression in the early narratives of Israel than in the accounts of Abraham.* It was only on this basis that they hoped to be "a peculiar treasure above all people . . . a kingdom of priests and a holy nation." For in the recognition of all lack of merit or righteousness in themselves, lay the other element or subjective side of this covenant, namely faith in God. Although this demand of the covenant finds its clearest and plainest expression not in words but in the actions of the people, in their following of God's appointed servant and their willingness to be guided by Jehovah, yet it is also plainly expressed, that Israel as a people and the individual is acceptable and righteous before the Lord, i. e. is true to the covenant relation with the Lord, if he, like his forefathers the patriarchs, puts all his trust and confidence in God and Him alone.† The chief sin of which the Mosaic system has any knowledge is that of idolatry, which is nothing but the transfer of faith and confidence from the true to a false God. In this manner the covenant relation could be and was most flagrantly violated, and against this sin the very first of the ten commandments is directed. It recognizes faith then as the subjective basis of this covenant. Indeed the whole spirit of God's revelations to Israel and His deeds in the formative stage of their natural life show clearly enough two things as essential elements in the covenant established between them, namely, first, that God chose Israel and showers His blessings upon it as an act of pure grace and mercy; and, secondly, that Israel, if it would be acceptable before the Lord, must in faith and obedience follow the leading of the Lord. An Israelite was then true to the covenant if his life and actions

* Cf. Ex. 19, 5; 15, 13. 16. 26. Num. CC., 11. 12. 16. 20.

† Cf. such passages as Ex. 3, 11 ff.; 4, 1. 8. f. 31; 24, 3. 7; 19, 8. Cf. also Schultz. *A. Flöche. Theologie*, 2nd Ed., p. 30, 1 sqq.

showed that he had faith and confidence in the Lord of the covenant.

But how about the law? Does not the existence and object of the Mosaic law prove false the view of the Old Testament religion here expressed? By no means; but, if rightly understood, it only confirms what has been said. It cannot be repeated too often that to identify the Old Covenant with the Mosaic dispensation, or to make Mt. Sinai annul the Abrahamic covenant and establish in its place a new covenant with a principle of legal righteousness, is totally false. The teachings of Moses nowhere claim this for themselves and there is no scriptural testimony for such a view. The law finds its mission in and within the covenant, and represents one stage in the growth and unfolding of this covenant. Its object was not to supplant the covenant of grace and faith, but rather to be subservient in preparing the way for it in Israel and in the history of God's kingdom. Paul, who so clearly states that the Old Testament saints were justified by faith alone, has not forgotten to inform us of the important work of the law in the unfolding of God's plans. He says, Gal. 3, 19: "Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions till the seed should come to whom the promise was made;" and in verses 21-24: "Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid: for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law. But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe. But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto faith which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the law was a school-master [tutor R. V.] to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith." The expression *παιδαργός εἰς Χριστόν* tells the secret. The law was an educational means to bring the people to a realization of the requirements and to a full and real acceptance of the covenant. Its aim was a propaedeutic and preparatory one, both for Israel and for history. If the ideal as expressed in the official covenant established at Mt. Sinai was ever to become a life and truth in the hearts of the people and not a mere outward formality, then the people would have to be educated up to an understanding of its principles and the acceptance of all that it involved. That they had not attained to this standard when the covenant was established, or indeed ever afterwards, is one of the most evident teachings of their history. A righteousness accounted through faith implies a recognition of a want of righteousness in oneself, and a dependence for righteousness and salvation upon somebody else. In the covenant of the Old as in that of the New Testament the anthropological principle of an absolute in-

ability to render oneself acceptable or just before God, as also the soteriological principle that such a salvation or re-establishment of that true relationship between God and man which had existed before the break caused by sin, must come from the grace and mercy of the Lord, are implied and presupposed. The covenant required faith and absolute allegiance to God; but faith and absolute allegiance to God would be possible only when it was apparent that such faith and allegiance in the redemptive work of a promised Messiah whose life, merits and death could atone for sins and satisfy all just demands on man, were the only means of righteousness. And this brought with it the further truth that any departure from such a life of faith, i. e. any sin of whatever nature or character, was also a violation of the covenant relation and hence a forfeiture of the blessings it brought, for which sin some restoration and atonement would have to be made if the broken covenant relation was to be re-established. That all these principles are embraced in the covenant in its Mosaic form is apparent from the sacrificial and atonement system, where they are recognized by word and deed.

In order that these great truths of God's plan of redemption should work out their way into the consciousness and convictions of the chosen people, and that they should become the people of the covenant in truth, God establishes them as a politico-religious state, under His own rule, and gives the whole complex system of moral and ceremonial law known as Mosaic and contained in the Pentateuch. This body formed the limits in which the covenant as a soul should have its being and undergo its development. The whole legal system, as established by Moses, in its religious, political and social features was the outward wall that protected the inner growth of the covenant principles and at the same time promoted the latter. The commands of the Lord, from the height of the ten commandments down to the lowest and least behest for the conduct of private affairs represented to those under the covenant the just demands which the Lord of the covenant had a right to make upon those who would possess the blessings of the covenant; it represented to those who had sworn allegiance to this covenant at Mt. Sinai the duties which they owed to Jehovah. It brought directly and strongly before their eyes the knowledge of which a faithful performance of their covenant relation demanded of them, and at the same time would necessarily awaken in them a consciousness of their inability to comply with these demands and to be faithful to their promise. Indeed this latter fact of inability and of a sinful state is recognized by the law itself as a necessary feature in the life of those subject to it. For the same law that commands and condemns also provides for means of pardon and atone-

ment for the violation of its mandates. The sacrificial portion of the Mosaic system can be understood only on the premises that an honest child of the covenant would recognize the sinful state and deserved condemnation and rejection, and that the life under the law would necessarily be a life of constant confession of transgression and a constant resort to the throne of Jehovah for pardon and renewed reception. This feature of the legal code shows that at the bottom of the covenant of which it was the outward framework, lay the ideas of repentance for sins and faith in Jehovah to forgive these sins. As Christ says, Matt. 23, 23, the weightier matters of the law were "judgment, mercy and faith." To promote these in the hearts of the Israelites was the purpose of the Sinaitic code. Its complex character and minute ramifications covered the whole public and private existence of the Israelite and constantly reminded him what he owed to his divine king whose rule he had chosen for himself by agreeing to the covenant. Hence too for the Israelite there was no difference between a moral and a ceremonial law: both were equally an expression of the will of Jehovah under the covenant relation; a violation of either was a rejection of the principle of faith and obedience and hence equally punishable. Later, when the kingdom of God had passed beyond the circumscribed state of the limits of a single nation and particularism had developed into universalism, then these features of the law which were conditioned by the preparatory stage and were not based upon the fundamental truths of the covenant could fall away, as they did when Christ came and established the congregation of saints, not only in Israel, but over the whole world. But as long as the covenant was circumscribed by locality and nationality for the education of a peculiar people, so long too all those laws established by God for effecting His purpose were equally binding upon the adherents of the covenant. Under such circumstances a transgression of a ceremonial law was punishable equally with one of a moral command.

These facts explain why it is that in the establishment of the covenant, as this is recorded in Ex. 19 sqq., so much stress is laid upon the obedience of the people to the commands of the Lord. This obedience is the obedience of faith, and the faith of those living under the legal rule finds its expression in the obedience to this law of the covenant. An Israelite is "just" in so far as he complies with the norm of the law, because a transgression of these laws given by Jehovah for the guidance of his life and worship is a rejection of the authority of God and a refusal to trust him. A rebellion against God's ordinances is a rebellion against the very covenant itself. An Israelite who truly believed in Jehovah would necessarily feel himself in duty bound to obey these

laws. He could not do otherwise, or his life and his confession would antagonize each other. But never do we read that such an obedience is to be regarded in itself as a meritorious act or as a means of righteousness. The Mosaic system knows of no legal or work righteousness.

While recognizing then their duty to obey in all its minutiae the commands of the law and learning by that how sinful they were, those under the law put their trust for righteousness and deliverance in the mercy of the Lord. Just to what extent the object of their faith is the mercy of God in general or is the merit of the promised Seed, might be a debatable question. Their life under the law certainly pointed out to them the necessity of looking solely to the grace of Jehovah, but to what extent they were conscious of the fact that the objective grounds of this grace were the life and death of a promised Messiah may not be easily decided, although the most advanced children of the covenant undoubtedly were quite conscious of this great truth. Cf. John 8, 56 and Gal. 3, 10-18. Certain it is that from the time of the protevangelium in Genesis 3 to the evangelistic flights in the second part of Isaiah there is a golden chain of prophecies running through the whole Old Testament life and revelation, that a Redeemer and Messiah should come. And that in the Mosaic system this personal Savior is the basis of faith seems evident from the typical and symbolical actions in the sacrifices and atonements, as their true significance and meaning are explained in the Epistle to the Hebrews. There and in other places in the New Testament the typical character of the tabernacle, of the cultus in its different kinds, of the festivals etc. is recognized and the relation between type and thing typified shown.* And then Moses repeatedly recognizes the coming of a personal Deliverer, and has before it also all the grand prophecies to this effect given to the patriarchs centuries before.

Such then was, according to the New Testament and also according to the Old, the historical mission of the law in its relation to and bearing on the Old Covenant. Far from standing in antagonism to a covenant of grace and faith, its aim was to develop and make such a covenant the soul and life of a nation, so that its principles might become in the growth of this people some of the great truths of history, that, in the fulness of time Christianity might base its work of victory on such results of earlier developments.

Hand in hand with the Mosaic dispensation and closely allied to it was the prophecy in Israel. It is a fatal error of the new critical school to put the law and the prophets in

* The best authorities on this interesting subject are Bähr's *Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus*, Keil's *Archaeologie* and Kurtz's *Sacrificial System*.

antagonism to each other. Those passages in the prophets that seem to speak slightly of the law can be interpreted as opposition to the proper mission and functions of the law only by misinterpretation of the legalism in the religious development of Israel. Not the use, but the abuse of the law, by reducing it to an *opus operatum* formalism or to a means of pharisaic selfrighteousness, is condemned by the prophets.* Moses himself, the lawgiver, was also a prophet, and both Mosaism and prophecy, in their divine purpose and actual workings, conspired together toward the development of the great truths of the Covenant between God and the chosen people. Instead of being contradictory or antagonistic, they are rather mutually complementary and aim to make God's plans facts and truths. While the law points out to man the duties he is to perform as a child of the covenant and thus instructs him in the great truth of sin and the constant need of divine pardon and mercy, and while this law is to make these truths the teachings of Israel's history in them and for others, the prophets, as the speakers and seers of God, accompany this historical development with their revelations of knowledge, reproof, guidance and consolation. The prophets are the instructors of the people sent by the Lord of the covenant so that the people would be taught to walk and live aright under the conditions of His covenant toward the fulfillment of their historical mission. Prophecy had thus, like the law, a work to perform in the unfolding of God's kingdom, and this work was for the same ultimate end, in the case of both the early prophets of action as the later literary prophets. It must not be forgotten that the chief work of the prophets was not, as is sometimes supposed to be, the prediction of future events. The prophets were decidedly men of words and action for the immediate present, for the demands of the hour. They preached to Israel and not only or principally to later generations, and what they did and said was intended to have its effect in moulding the religious destiny of the people they addressed. All prophecy, both those specially so-called as also the historical books written in a prophetic spirit, must be looked upon as reflecting the character and life of the Old Covenant. They represent one phase in the development of this covenant and hence can fairly be called upon for instruction as to what the real nature of this covenant was. The lives and teachings of the prophets as well as of all those under the Old Covenant who proved acceptable before the Lord can be properly regarded as expressive of its genius and spirit. Yet nowhere do we find among the prophets or other Old Testament saints

* The relations between the law and the prophets has recently been made the subject of an excellent work by Bredenkamp, entitled "Gesetz und Propheten," Erlangen 1881. Cf. Oehler § 201.

a single one who considered himself just because of his obedience to the law, and who based the correctness of his attitude to the covenant, and consequently his hope of justification, upon the fulfillment of the Mosaic code. The experience and faith of the men of God under the old dispensation, as this finds utterance in the records of their sacred volume, these correct indices of the religious life and hope under the covenant, leaves no room for doubt or debate, that they knew nothing of a legal or self-righteousness. One thing is sure, that the saints of the Old Testament felt and rejoiced in their acceptance before God; for then full righteousness and membership in the kingdom of God was not regarded simply as a possibility of the future, but as a present reality and fact. That the prophets and psalmists and all the true representatives of the Old Testament covenant life felt this in their heart of hearts, and that peace with God was to their soul's existence and life, is as historically certain as anything in the sacred records can be. And that they did not base this happiness upon the righteousness of the law, is equally certain. The total absence of any word or hint in this direction is sufficient proof. But we have evidence in abundance that the very opposite is their teaching. The prophets as a rule, start out with the lesson of the law, namely the recognition and confession of sin. They recite how merciful the Lord has been to His people, how undeserving of this grace they have been and how unfaithful in their covenant relation. On the basis of this knowledge they exhort the people to repentance and faith, assuring them in the name of the Lord of the covenant, whose spokes-men they are, that if the sinners will return in repentance, the Lord will pardon them their transgression and again receive them as His own peculiar people, and that they should put their faith and confidence in Him and in Him alone. It is this line of thought that we everywhere find in the prophetic words and prophetic deeds. They upbraid sin, call to repentance and then offer the repentant and trusting sinner the fulness of God's mercy. In the prophetic feature of the Old Covenant development these are the cardinal and leading thoughts, and show with clearness that for them too it was a covenant of grace.* In one prominent point the prophets advance beyond Moses, namely in their clear announcement of the objective ground of the grace which God promises to the penitent sinner. The Messianic features of the prophecies constantly grow in clearness and emphasis, until in such flights as Is. 53 we seem to hear not a prophecy but the record of history. The evangelical feature in prophecy is ever unfolding itself more and

* Cf. in this connection especially Oehler, l. c. § 202, and Schultz, in the *Jahrb. f. D. Theologie*, 1862, p. 541 ff., where this subject, of which we give only the leading ideas, is fully and exhaustively treated.

more. In their hands the law becomes more and more a school-master unto Christ. They teach not only that the law cannot justify, and that in His mercy God will do so, but also that He will do so for the sake of the future Redeemer. They believed not only in a salvation to come, but also in a Savior to come, and it was thus only that the circuit of saving truths was completed.

This then, in general outlines, is the character of the Old Testament covenant. It is like the new, a covenant of grace; the fundamental ideas of both are the same. The chief difference lies in this that in the old is found the preparatory stage, when within the bounds of a nation and the hedge of a law, the consciousness of sin and need of a Savior were developed; the new starts out with this knowledge and proclaims the Savior from these sins. The sins demanded a sacrifice: Christ did, by His life and death, become a sacrifice and atonement; and with these words the greatest difference between the Old and the New Testament covenant has been stated. The Old teaches the knowledge of sin and looks forward to a coming sacrifice, as a hope and promise; the new starts out with this conviction and has the complete sacrifice already performed. But the basis of hope, the object of faith is in both the same, namely Christ Jesus, our Lord.

In view of these facts it may be called a piece of doubtful wisdom to speak of two covenants at all. In reality there is but one covenant, namely that of grace and faith, but in two historical stages of development, the preparatory and the completed. Between the two there is not a difference of kind, but of degree. The traditional theological terminology as generally understood tends rather to separate and keep apart as two distinct or even antagonistic things that are really but two sides of one and the same thing. The covenant idea is the connecting link between the two Testaments as it is declared to be by the preaching of John the Baptist and of Christ. They announce that the kingdom of God, which had hitherto been in preparation and a promise, had now arrived and was at hand; and they consciously thus place their mission and work in direct connection as complementary to that which had preceded. They build upon Moses and the prophets.

Many questions of Old Testament religion and Isagogics naturally suggest themselves in connection with this outline of what is the central thought of the Old Testament development, especially the bearing which the correct and biblical view of this development must have in deciding the vexed problems proposed by the Wellhausen-Smith school. But the discussion of these points would go entirely too far in connection with an article of a general character like the present and besides they would not materially affect the result of this

investigation. Suffice it, that our examination has shown how intimately, in their roots and essence, the two Testaments are connected, and how correct is the terse dictum of Augustine that the new lies concealed in the old and the old lies revealed in the new. Both proclaim the sin of man, but both announce also that the mercy of God is ready to pardon man, if he repents. They record for us how God, who did not desire the dire work of sin to succeed, made a covenant for the purpose of thwarting the destruction of mankind, how this covenant, in which God asked that man should have faith and confidence in Him alone, grew and developed under the politico-religious kingdom of Israel, until in the fulness of time this development had taught beyond a doubt the need of a Savior, the Savior really came and performed His mission of love and redemption. The new and the old are one undivided revelation because they are the record of one kingdom of God on earth.

G. H. S.

HOMILETICAL DEPARTMENT.

FIRST SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY. ROM. 12, 1-5.

A.

Int. 1. The present season of Epiphany should remind us of the time when we were separate from Christ—alienated from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers etc. etc. But that now we, that once were far off, are made nigh in the blood of Christ—that we are fellow citizens with the saints and of the household of God. Comp. Eph. c. 2.

2. The blessedness of the relation we now sustain to Christ and Christians, as the Scriptures speak of it and as our hearts experience it. But yet, of this itself we would not speak to-day; but rather of this how such relation to Christ should lead us to live a holy and useful life also, as our text suggests.

THE HOLY SERVICE ENJOINED ON US BY OUR MEMBERSHIP IN THE BODY OF CHRIST.

Prelim. Remark: Of course, without Christ we can do nothing. Apart from Him we are dead in trespasses and sins; but engrafted into Him, the living Head, life of His life is infused into us and so are we quickened to do something acceptable to God.

I. *That, in body and soul, we be sanctified wholly unto God.*

1. Presenting our bodies a living sacrifice
 - a) sacrifice: Old Testament priesthood and its sacrifices have passed away; but we too are priests before God, and what we are to sacrifice, we are here told, i. e.
 - b) our bodies, living, holy and acceptable before God.—Away with every abuse of our body: gluttony, drunkenness, wantonness, foolhardiness etc.
2. Being renewed in our minds, unto an increased
 - a) knowledge of God's will;
 - b) conformity with God's will of our own will.

(Away with ignorance in things spiritual—ignorance is a sin—and away with vain doubts and speculations, with worldwisdom in so far as it militates against the wisdom of God—bad literature etc.)

II. *That we, as members together, edify one another*

1. in humble love
2. according to the gifts received.

C. H. L. S.

B.

THE LIFE OF TRUE CHRISTIANS AN UNBROKEN SERVICE
OF GOD.

- I. *They present themselves unto God daily as living sacrifices.*
- II. *They labor, without ceasing, for the renewal of their minds.*
- III. *They manifest this by an humble and loving service of the brethren.*

FROM THE GERMAN OF AHLFELD.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY. ROM. 12, 6-16.

Int. A. “For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God. Not of works, lest any man should boast.”

B. “For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.” Eph. 2, 8-10.

Here is set forth the true relation between salvation and good works. Salvation is the free gift of God's grace; works on our part an expression of gratitude for the gift received. Of His own gracious will are we begotten of God and made His sons and daughters; and because such, the love and obedience of sons and daughters are required of us as of children. The Lord has redeemed us for His service also.

SUNDAY DIRECTIONS ABOUT SERVING THE LORD.

- I. *That each one employ the gifts received, and abide in the calling pointed out to him.*
 1. Differences of gifts,
 - a) by nature,
 - b) by special grace.
 2. Differences of offices,
 - a) all profitable,
 - b) all honorable.
- II. *That, however divers the gifts and offices, all be led by the same spirit.*
 1. Not of natural love, which is blind and corrupt.
 2. Of sanctified love, which is (v. 9-12.)
 - a) without dissimulation,
 - b) holy—abhors etc.,
 - c) kind and respectful,
 - d) fervent and active,
 - e) hopeful and patient.
- III. *That at no time we esteem ourselves sufficient in self, but rely wholly on that grace which God giveth.*
 1. All our sufficiency is of God; and
 2. To God we have access through Christ by prayer.
- IV. *That we confine our service to no particular class of men, but do good to all.*
 1. To friend and foe (13-14.)
 2. To each according to his need (15).

V. *That we insist not unduly on our own works and ways and methods, but peaceably cooperate with others.* V. 16.

1. Be not overwise or conceited.
2. Be not vain-glorious or ambitious.
3. Love, and follow after, unity and union.

Conclusion. The fact that we come so utterly short of meeting such our holy obligations should teach us the impossibility of being saved by works; to cling all the more to Christ for righteousness; and to God for sanctifying grace.

C. H. L. S.

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY. ROM. 12, 17-21.

A.

THE CHRISTIAN SCHOOL OF PEACE.

- I. *Lesson: Disturb not the peace by any fault of your own.*
- II. *Lesson: Keep the peace, as much as in you lieth.*
- III. *Lesson: Make peace, by doing good to all.*

ADAPTED FROM THE GERMAN OF GEROCK.

B.

THE CHRISTIAN, A MAN OF PEACE.

- I. *He loves peace.*
- II. *He preserves peace.*
- III. *He makes peace.*

FROM THE GERMAN OF CASPARI.

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY. ROM. 13, 8-10.

A.

THE HOLY DEBT OF LOVE.

- I. *Owed by all!*
- II. *Paid by none!*

Con. Rom. 10, 4. and Rom. 8, 2.

C. H. L. S.

B.

THE LOVE OF THE NEIGHBOR AND THE LOVE OF GOD
ARE ONE.

- I. *We love God in loving our neighbor.*
- II. *We love our neighbor in loving God.*

FROM NEBE'S EP. VOL. 3. p. 29 OF DISP.

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY. COL. 3, 12-17.

LET THE WORD OF CHRIST DWELL IN YOU!

- I. *The meaning of this exhortation* · 16a.

1. The word of Christ is the Gospel, with
 - a) its light—as a word of instruction, wisdom, assurances, etc.
 - b) its gifts—as the bearer of saving grace, i. e. of Christ, His merits, pardon, etc.
 - c) its power—as the means through which the Spirit works faith, love, etc.
2. The word is to dwell in us, that is
 - a) enlighten,
 - b) enrich,
 - c) quicken us, and continue to do this in us without ceasing, "richly" and unto "all wisdom," etc.

II. *Whereunto this is profitable*
 1. in our relation to God, 15-17,
 2. in our relation to men, 12-14.

C. H. L. S.

SIXTH SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY. 2 PET. 1, 16-21.

A.

WHEN ARE WE FIRMLY GROUNDED IN THE FAITH?

I. *When we place the witnesses of God above the fables (and words of men).*
 II. *When by the Word of God we are directed to the bright Day-star (the Day-star arise in our hearts).*

FROM THE GERMAN OF MUENKEL.

B.

MOST SURE IS THE WORD WE PREACH UNTO YOU!

I. *God the Father Himself has spoken it;*
 II. *The Holy Spirit Himself has inspired it;*
 III. *It approves itself as the word of truth.*

FROM NEBES EP. III. p. 33 DISP.

SEPTUAGESIMAE. 1 COR. 9, 24-10, 5.

Int. That it is the good and gracious will of God our Savior that all His Christians stand in connection with the Church also in so far as this is an outward and visible body, there can be no doubt. The object and end of the true visible Church is to confess her Lord and His truth, and to be instrumental in doing His work of saving souls. They, therefore, who refuse to belong to the Christian Church, refuse to confess Christ the Lord who bought them, they deny His saving truth, and they hinder His blessed work. In short, they deceive themselves when they think that they can be Christians and yet deny Christ—Christ will deny them before His Father in heaven. Matt. 10, 32.

Yet, though it is a holy duty and a blessed privilege as well, to stand also in formal connection with the Christian Church, it must not be inferred from this that all who so belong are for that reason true Christians and really saved. Many, alas, are misled by this notion and lost to God on account of it. The Gospel of the tares among the wheat teaches us that there are mixed up with Christians such as are not Christians at heart; also, that at the end of time the angel of God will single out these hypocrites, etc. Likewise our epistol. lesson of to-day teaches us that

MANY ARE FOUND IN THE COMPANY OF GOD'S PEOPLE, HAVING FREE ACCESS TO THE GOOD THINGS OF HIS HOUSE, AND YET PERISH; AND MANY RUN THE RACE, AND YET OBTAIN NO CROWN.

Either

I. *Because they are not sincere; or*
 II. *Because they err concerning the saving truth; or also*
 III. *Because they do not continue faithful to the end.*

Ad I. The thoughtless, indifferent, hypocritical.

1. Since they are in fellowship with the people of God they have indeed all the instruction, correction, grace and blessings of God's house offered them. V. 1-4. But

2. While they profess to love the good things of God, and seem to delight in His services, in their hearts they lust after evil things and in the dark no doubt practice them also. 1 Cor. 10, 6.
 These are rejected and cast away. V. 5.

Ad II. The erring and fanatical.

1. These run indeed, and earnestly too, but not in the right race; nor do they, in consequence, run aright. V. 24-27. *So run that, etc.*
 2. With all their confidence of victory, they fail to obtain the crown. No, good intentions save no man. With their blind leaders they come to grief. How sad! But then, men must not walk in their own ways: only God's ways lead to God and God's heaven. Christ the way. The word the light, etc.

Ad III. The faint-hearted and faithless.

1. These forget, that they must hold fast to what they have received, and grow in grace. (A word especially for the baptized and confirmed.)
 2. With the loss of their faith they lose Christ and all!—Of the 600,000 which left Egypt for Canaan, only two entered the promised land, Caleb and Joshua. They were all on the way, but on the way to Canaan they perished. C. H. L. S.

SEXAGESIMAE. 2 COR. 11, 19-12, 9.

A.

"AS THE SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST ABOUND IN US, SO OUR CONSOLATION ALSO ABOUNDETH BY CHRIST JESUS."

I. *Our sufferings for Christ.*

II. *Our consolations by Christ.*

C. H. L. S.

B.

THE ALL-SUFFICIENCY OF DIVINE GRACE.

I. *For our redemption;*

II. *For our sanctification;*

III. *In our labors for the kingdom;*

IV. *In our sufferings, especially those for Christ's sake;*

V. *In the hour of death and of judgment.*

ADAPTED.

ESTOMIHI. 1 COR. 13.

Int. The source of love: the mercy of God, by Christ, through the Spirit.

THE CANTICLES OF LOVE.

IN THREE PARTS.

I. *Without love, all our gifts and operations are worthless.* 1-3.

II. *Love can do no harm, but moves unto every good work.* 4-7.

III. *Love abides, and in this grace we shall live unto God forever.*

8-13. C. H. L. S.

INVOCAVIT. 2 COR. 6, 1-10.

A.

Int. 1. "Thus saith the Lord: thou hast made me to serve with thy sins, thou hast wearied me with thine iniquities!" Isa. 43, 24. This painful servitude and this severe weariness which our Savior endured as our substitute and on account of our sins, constitute the burden of our meditations and preaching in the season of Lent.

2. Our lesson says nothing directly of the passion of Christ; but it does beseech us not to despise so great a grace as is revealed to us in the life and death of Christ and declared by His Gospel. In the strongest terms our lesson pleads with us for a fruitful reception of that grace—and so it is well adapted to serve us toward a proper observance of our Lord's passion. .

THE EARNEST ENTREATY: RECEIVE NOT IN VAIN THE GRACE OF GOD!

I. *With truly believing hearts yield to it for yourselves.*

1. The grace to be received:

From the text and context we see that the fullness of God's grace is meant; i. e.

- a) to our justification cap. 5, 19-21,
- b) to our sanctification. V. 3-10.

2. The receiving of that grace:

- a) "not in vain;" i. e. when the head and the outward life are affected, but not the heart; or when according to Jude 4 we turn the grace of God into lasciviousness—or when we receive it for a while only.

- b) the effectual and fruitful reception is when the heart, etc.,—and that is to be attended to now. V. 2.

II. *With faithful loving hearts press it upon others.*

Like St. Paul, and as workers together with Christ.

- 1. As we are called and enabled to do. V. 1 and 6-7.

- 2. In no way hindering the course of the Gospel. V. 3.

- 3. With much self-denying labor. V. 5.

- 4. Doing battle for the Lord. V. 7-8.

- 5. Enduring hardships and sufferings. V. 4 etc.

- 6. Comforted in things evil and enriched in things good. V. 9-10.

C. H. L. S.

B.

DAY'S OF SUFFERING ARE DAYS OF SALVATION.

As manifest from

I. *The sufferings of Christ;*

II. *The sufferings of Christians.*

FROM THE GERMAN OF NESELMANN.

REMINISCERE. 1 THESS. 4, 1-7.

A.

OF THE POWER OF JESUS' PASSION TO SANCTIFY US.

I. *In general:*

The import of our entire lesson is: "This is the will of God, even your sanctification. If we would be holy, we must

- 1. hate what is sinful; and
- 2. love what is good.

Unto this the sufferings of Jesus are our strength: as by them (in consequence of our justification before God and by Him on account of them) we die unto sin we become alive unto the good.

II. *In particular:*

Two graces are mentioned in our text;

- 1. chastity;

To protect ourselves against uncleanness, etc., we must look at the suffering Jesus, and remember: it is the lust of our flesh which has covered His holy body with so many wounds; with His

blood He has cleansed our souls and bodies . . . and will continue to cleanse them . . .

2. righteousness (of life);

To protect ourselves against unrighteous dealing, think (among other things) of the 30 pieces of silver for which Judas betrayed his Lord to the murderers. Will you sell your Lord?

FROM THE GERMAN OF WESTERMEIER.

B.

WHEREIN SHOULD WE ABOUND MORE AND MORE?

I. *In the knowledge* } of God's will.
II. *In the doing* }

FROM NEBE . . . p. 43.

OCULI. EPH. 5, 1-9.

Int. 1. In his letter to the Philippians St. Paul says: "To write the same things to you, to me indeed is not grievous, but for you it is safe." Of these words am I reminded by the sameness of those lessons which for some time past were presented for our consideration . . .

2. In their criticisms of the sermon, the hearers quite often say: "There was nothing new—it was the same old thing over again!" To such hearers the preaching was irksome.* . . . In answer to them, I would urge: the preacher is not called to say what is necessarily new to everybody, or what some people account of as new; and then, they themselves may have failed to perceive what indeed would have been new to them, had they given to it proper attention. Lastly, and this is the chief point in our answer: the word which we preach has a double office, to wit: to convey and recall knowledge and to exercise power unto the hearers' edification and salvation. Now as a sanctifying and saving power, the Word of God is ever new and ever needful to all men.

3. Writing to the Corinthians, Paul says: "Knowledge puffeth up, but charity buildeth up." (I. 8. 1.) A man may have all saving knowledge even, and not be saved. See Heb. 10, 26. Even the knowledge of God's Word may be abused; and it is abused by those who wish to possess themselves of it only to boast of their learning, etc. Then, too, even with us who are saved, the head, as a rule, is far in advance of the heart; we know, but we do not. So well are people acquainted with godliness, that they are next to perfect in its forms, and yet deny the power of it.

After this somewhat strange introduction, we venture to take up again an old subject—a holy life. We will ask and answer the question.

WHAT SHOULD INDUCE CHRISTIANS TO EXERCISE THEM-SELVES UNTO GODLINESS OF HEART AND LIFE?

1. *The holiness of God our Maker.* V. 1a.

a) As our model. "Be ye followers, imitators of God." Here we can see what true godliness is: not equality with, but likeness unto God in what we are to be and do.

b) As our motive. Our duty to God as our Maker should constrain us—His perfection and blessedness invite us to aspire unto godliness.

*The worst hearers of God's Word, when preached, are perhaps the preachers themselves. Habitually, they would know *what* is said, and *how* this is said—hoping thereby to learn something to make use of in their calling. This is all well; but if we stop there, we are bad hearers. We should ask, not only what is that which is said to us as preachers, but also: what is it to us as poor sinners, etc., and so let the Word preached work on our souls for their saving.

2. *The passion of Christ our Savior.* V. 2.
 a) Which being an expression of God's indignation at sin, can we love it?
 b) Which being the work of redeeming love and mercy, should we not hate sin which has so bruised our dear Lord?
3. *The sanctifying help of God the Spirit.* V. 3.
 a) We are saints, that means justified and sanctified sinners.
 b) Sin does not become us as saints, but rather godlessness.
4. *The high dignity of our position as children of God.* V. 1b.
5. *The call to be a light in the Lord.* V. 8.
 a) We are enlightened.
 b) We are called to enlighten others.
6. *The severe judgments of God.* V. 4-7.

C. H. L. S.

LAETARE. GAL. 4, 21-31.

BY GRACE ARE YE SAVED.

- I. *Grace gives to us the rights of children.*
- II. *Grace works in us the nature of children.*
- III. *Grace lays up for us the portion of children.*

FROM THE GERMAN OF CASPARI.

JUDICA. HEB. 9, 11-15.

CHRIST THE HIGHPRIEST OF THE NEW COVENANT.

- I. *The sacrifice He hath rendered.*
- II. *The blessings He hath secured.*

C. H. L. S.

PALM SUNDAY. PHIL. 2, 5-11.

BY THE CROSS TO THE CROWN.

- I. *Such was the watchword of our Lord.*
- II. *Such should be the watchword of us all.*

FROM NEBE'S EP. p. 52.

GOOD FRIDAY. ISA. 53.

THE MAN OF SORROWS.

- I. *The most despised and unworthy in the eyes of men.*
- II. *The most merciful and gracious toward sinners.*
- III. *The most humble and obedient before God.*
- IV. *The most rich and powerful in heaven and earth.*

FROM NEBE'S EP. p. 56.

EASTER-DAY. 1 COR. 5, 6-8.

Int. 1. And now the joyous Easter-days have come again—days commemorative of the great victory which Christ, the Captain of our salvation, has obtained for us. God's people are glad to-day; for "The Lord is risen indeed!" God hath brought from the dead the great Shepherd of the sheep. The price of our redemption is accepted, and our peace is made. Death is swallowed up in victory. Life and immortality are brought to light.

2. You cannot well make too much of the resurrection of Christ; for, if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain and ye are yet in your sins. 1 Cor. 15, 17. (Christmas and Good Friday in the light of Easter.)

3. "But now is Christ risen from the dead. Wherefore He is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them." Heb. 7, 25. The Lord is risen indeed! and we also are saved. He is therefore the real paschal Lamb and our true Passover.

OUR PASSOVER IS, CHRIST WHO DIED FOR US AND ROSE AGAIN.

I. *The Passover.*

1. Of the Israelites according to the flesh. (Consult Old Testament History.)
2. Of the Israelites according to the Spirit.
 - a) Our spiritual bondage under the spiritual Pharaoh—Satan.
 - b) Our deliverance by Christ—our Moses.
 - c) By our Lord's resurrection God Himself testifies to our complete deliverance.

II. *The feast of the Passover.*

1. Among the Israelites after the flesh. (See History, as before.)
2. Among the Israelites after the Spirit.
 - a) Not with the old leaven—
 - b) With the unleavened bread of—

Con. The old Israelites had their paschal bread—so we: the Bread of heaven, even the body and blood of Jesus our Passover.

C. H. L. S.

THE COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

This Magazine is designed to supply the want, long since felt, of a Lutheran periodical devoted to theological discussion. Its aim will be the exposition and defence of the doctrines of the Church as confessed in the Book of Concord. Theology in all its departments is embraced within its scope, though for the present special attention will be given to the controverted subject of predestination.

1. The Magazine is published bi-monthly, each number containing 64 pages.

2. The terms are \$2.00 per annum, payable in advance, which includes postage. Single numbers 35 cents.

3. All remittances should be addressed to J. L. Trauger, Agent, Columbus, O. All Communications pertaining to the Editorial Department to Prof. M. Loy, Columbus, O.

The friends of the Magazine are requested to give such aid in its circulation as their circumstances permit.

CONTENTS OF No. I.

	PAGE.
1. THE DISCIPLINE OF THE WILL, by Prof. M. Loy.....	1
2. CONFESSION CONCERNING SOME CONTROVERTED POINTS OF DOCTRINE. Translated by A. Huus	25
3. THE CHARACTER OF THE OLD TESTAMENT COVENANT, by Dr. G. H. Schodde	35
4. HOMILETICAL DEPARTMENT, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette.....	57

C O L U M B U S

THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

A BI-MONTHLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF
THE EV. LUTHERAN CHURCH.

EDITED BY THE FACULTY OF CAPITAL UNIVERSITY.

VOL. V.—No. II.

APRIL, 1885.

COLUMBUS, OHIO:
LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN OF THE OHIO SYNOD.
1885.

T H E

COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE

VOL. V.

APRIL, 1885.

No. 2.

HOW SHALL WE ORDER OUR LIVES?

"If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable." Yes, if our longing souls are to be satisfied with the things of this earth, if death is the end of man's being, if our highest expectations are to be buried with us, and if the fruits of our labors are to perish with the breath of time, then indeed are we among all men the most miserable. Then may we too inquire, and with more reason than they who have not our Christian hope: Is life worth living? Does existence compensate us for the struggle of it, and do life's fleeting pleasures outweigh its lingering pain? "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that are asleep." And He says: Because I live, ye shall live also! Having this hope in us, and by its strength having passed from darkness and death to light and life, we cannot entertain the question whether life is worth living. The very sound of it falls harshly on our hearing; and it strikes us as the outcry of a soul estranged from God, captive to doubt, and dragged to the brink of despair.

We Christians know life to be a gift of God, and to possess an intrinsic value; we know it to have been bestowed for a high and holy purpose; we know the price of its redemption, and that it is destined to be made perfect in endless bliss and glory. We have an empiric certainty of its higher reality, and a foretaste of the sweet things with which it shall be satisfied. In short, we know and we believe beyond all question, that life is worth living. All the more must it con-

cern us to know how to live it worthily; how, by the grace given us, we may make full our days with deeds acceptable to God our Maker and Redeemer.

This last is a matter not so readily determined, as at first it might appear. When we have ascertained what work God would have done in this world, what is to be our motive and purpose in its doing, and whence is to be derived the strength for its performance, we have not done with the problem proposed. The real question, and the one most pertinent, is still before us. It is, that each one ask for himself, What would God have me do? To say—when one's special calling is already chosen—: attend to the work of my trade, my business, my profession, my office, etc., is something more toward a solution of our question; but the answer is by no means made full. Surely it cannot be the will of God that one man should spend all the days of his life, say, in the making and mending of shoes; another in the buying and selling of goods; a third in healing the sick; a fourth in ministering to the spiritual wants of his fellowmen; and so on. The particular and appropriate calling of an individual, while ordinarily it must have the first and fullest claim on his time and energies, can have no such exclusive right to them. No one's avocation, and be it what it may, comprehends the sum-total of his privileges and obligations. One may be a mechanic by trade, but never is he a mechanic only; and he has much to do other and higher than to ply the tools of his trade. So another may be called to the Gospel-ministry, desiring which a man desires a good office; but even a bishop in the church, wise and zealous and faithful though he be as a bishop, may for all that be a faulty man, and in many ways fail to meet the reasonable demands of life, where this is viewed in its manifold fulness.

The fact is, there are life-relations beyond and in part above those of a man's appointed and distinct calling—relations which this last does not cover, and each one of which includes a whole series of rights and duties more or less peculiar to it. To obtain a proper idea of its correctness and fulness, human life must be studied not only with reference to the several occupations of men, as specified: account must be taken also of those more common yet not the less sacred

spheres of life within which men are placed, into some by their creation, into others by the providence of God.

When a man distinguishes himself by outstripping others of his craft or profession, or if he covers himself with renown by the performance of some extraordinary deed, such feat may be to his praise and it may not. Were all the facts and circumstances attending the achievement made known, possibly his very praise might turn to his shame. Was he a great general? an eminent physician? a renowned author? a public benefactor? Very well! Meanwhile, what sort of a man and worker was he as a church-member, say, or as a husband and father? how did he treat his associates or near neighbors? and what did he for his own immortal self? If a man is a prodigy of erudition in one branch of literature and an ignoramus in every other, and as to the every-day affairs of life a veritable fool, he may astonish us, but he can neither excite the envy of the ambitious nor win the esteem of the just and good. When we know a little something and can do some few things, it is well to bethink us of the much we do not know and can not do, lest we exalt ourselves above measure. Be it, that among the sons of the nineteenth century there are those who excel the fathers of the sixteenth in the interpretation of tongues old and new, many and strange—yes, from the Sanscrit down to the Dutch—: let it not be forgotten that the fathers had more to do than to penetrate into the curious ways and by-ways of the humanities and that if they came short in these, they did accomplish all the more in other things. So all honor, we say, to the Christian mother whose heart goes out in active sympathy to the vagrant and wretched young that crowd our towns and cities; not so, however, if in her work of mercy and on account of it she flagrantly neglects the child of her own bosom. In a word: if any one have distinguished himself, let him look to the cost of it. And when we are told what this one has done and what another, it will not be amiss to inquire whether, in order to secure credit in one direction there has been default in any other. “Honor to whom honor is due,” says the good book; and we do well not to uncover before a monument unless we know it to have been deserved also.

The duties devolving on us as men and Christians in

view or by reason of our common life-relations and of our special calling, are more than can be numbered. They will crowd in on us in such quick succession, and with such ever-changing importance, that the doing of the one must often be postponed under pressure from another. Not unfrequently is the work of the day—or what was thought to be the work of the day before us—more than begun, when some other matter will demand our immediate attention; and with a force of reason and justice, too, that it cannot be rightfully put off. If postponed it be notwithstanding, the laborer may put in a good day's work, and, according to the ways of men, reap its reward; but he has been neglectful of duty. A greater delinquent is he, and more reprehensible, who abandons his own proper business, and slight the common offices of life, in order to accomplish some great thing in the world. Such is the way of the vainglorious man, and he thinks it good policy, no doubt; be this as it may, it certainly is a bad principle of action, and on little reflection will so appear to all thoughtful people. Another aberration of this sort, and one no less hurtful to the real interests of life, we meet with in the person who becomes so infatuated with his love for some object or accomplishment, that he makes a hobby of it. Obviously, such an one is not likely to concern himself much about the duties of the hoar or prove faithful in the work he is called to do.

Now if there is much criminal thoughtlessness manifesting itself in the fashions of men pointed out and in similar practices, there are indications also of not a little shrewdness in them, and a shrewdness which, we fear, is not wholly without guile. By some of these ways and methods of doing things, the road to fame—such as the world covets and bestows—is in a measure made cheap and easy. This some men are not slow in discerning. And in the discovery of it, a temptation is encountered which human nature, given to vanity as it is, has not the power long to resist.

Whoever gives little personal attention to his family can, as a matter of course, devote all the more time to the affairs of his club; and behold you, all other things being equal, by the unanimous acclaim of his cronies, he is declared clubber in chief. In like manner, an inactive and unprofitable

church-member may, in very consequence of such his weakness and imperfection, be all the more active and influential as a politician: if so, it would be strange indeed were his services to find no kind of public or party recognition, to the extent of a country squireship at the very least. So too, if a brother minister steals the time belonging to the pastor and bestows it on the preacher, quite likely his sermons will be all the more profound in thought and finished in style: and that is something which is apt to make a pleasant noise about his ears. A certain legend, found in the story-books of the good old fatherland, tells us about one Schinderhannes by name and a robber in exploit; now while it freely admits that Hannes was a much dreaded highwayman and burglar in his day, it strenuously insists that withal that he was a good man. This somewhat self-contradictory statement it explains by saying, that its hero only robbed the rich, and that he would always have the poor to share the spoils. Now it seems to us that they who devote their time and talents to the accomplishment of any one thing, however good in itself, when they are in duty bound to be otherwise employed, follow a philosophy of life not a whit better than that of the fellow immortalized in the legend. To be sure, it is a way that will draw the world's gaze on him who walks by it, and win for him its applause; but to desire honesty and faithfulness second to honor and fame: how great a vanity, what moral recklessness, and what a pitiful self-delusion!

And that not only: by this policy others are most shamefully imposed on and defrauded in not a few cases. An instance to illustrate: Here our friend John Dupenloop sends us his compliments, and his card, announcing that he is now become an M. D.; that he is a graduate of the great University So and So, and a pupil of the world-renowned professor Such an One; and that he will be pleased to give us the benefit of his knowledge and skill, should we be so unfortunate as to be in need of them. But now, who is this great man Such an One, that the mere mentioning of his name shall secure the success of his pupil? "Why"—says John—"he occupies the chair of hydropathy in the University So and So; a man of most extraordinary abilities and acquirements; though a young man as yet, he is already the author of many

learned works. Among these there are, "The Use and abuse of Phlebotomy," 7 vol's; "The sacharine Properties of the Red-beet," 2 vol's; "The curious Habits of the Ant-family" and "The Foot of the House-fly" bound together in one volume; then his grand work on "The four Humors" now in rapid preparation, and to be complete in 8 large volumes"—But enough! Now whether John has read what his medical master has written to build his fame on and to make money by; and reading it, what profit there was in it; of how much substantial benefit it has been to him to sit at the feet of a professor so very busy outside of the school-room and so famous all the world over; then too, what all these advantages and honors to the younger Dupenloop have cost Dupenloop the elder in cold cash--these are questions which, besides some others, our kind consideration for our poor young friend and doctor forbids us to ask. But how much humbuggery and fraud of this kind men practice on their fellows in all the departments of human industry, it might surprise even a pessimist to book upon, were it laid bare.

The erroneous and corrupt views of life and the false notions entertained respecting the objects of its activity, which underlie such practices as we have exposed to view and partly ridiculed, are not new. They are as old as is our depraved nature, and of which they are an exhibit. They prevailed in the days of our Lord and His Apostles; and against some of them we know they contended expressly. "Why"—inquires Christ of the Pharisees and scribes—"do you also transgress the commandment of God by your tradition? For God commanded, saying, Honor thy father and mother: and, He that curseth father or mother, let him die the death. But ye say, Whosoever shall say to his father or his mother, It is a gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me; And honor not his father or his mother, he shall be free. Thus have you made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition. Ye hypocrites, well did Esaias prophesy of you, saying, This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoreth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me. But in vain they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." Matt. 15, 3-9. "Wo unto you scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithe

of mint, and anise, and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith: these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone. Ye blind guides, which strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel." Matt. 23, 23-24. On this subject of will-worship, see also Col. 2, 8-23. Then in the writings of the Apostles we find among others the following exhortations and reproofs, bearing on the evils under discussion. "Let every man abide in the same calling, wherein he was called." 1 Cor. 7, 20. "Mind not high things, but condescend to men of low estate. Be not wise in your own conceits." Rom. 12, 16. "But let none of you suffer—as a busy-body in other men's matters." 1 Pet. 4, 15. "For we hear that there are some which walk among you disorderly, working not at all, but are busy-bodies. Now them that are such we command and exhort by our Lord Jesus Christ, that with quietness they work and eat their own bread." 2 Thess. 3, 11-12. "Let us not be desirous of vain glory, provoking one another, envying one another." Gal. 5, 26. "As every man has received the gift, even so minister the same one to another, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God." 1 Pet. 4, 10. "For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all churches of the saints." 1 Cor. 14, 23.

However, as St. Paul says of the ungodly, "their word will eat as doth a canker," even so here. Men would be wiser than God, and have their way in the things that are God's and subject to His ordering. And so the things were accomplished whereof "the Spirit speaketh expressly" in 1 Timothy 4, and elsewhere. For in the course of time these fallacies, so baneful to the power of godliness and destructive even to its forms, invaded the entire domain of Christendom. Once established there, they multiplied with a rankness and rapidity quite incredible, considering that the ground was holy. Eventually they so corrupted the system of Christian teaching and preyed upon the vitals of the Church to such an extent, as to threaten her with extinction. The Lord and His Word, that only rule of faith and life, were set aside for the authority of men and for human tradition—and thus set aside by those who were called to be ministers of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God! The anthropology of the

Scriptures was discarded for the fatal errors of pelagianism. The righteousness acquired by the Savior of all men was rejected, and in place of it self-righteousness was set up as the ground of salvation. The Father of mercies was depicted to the people as a hard task-master; His loving Son, the sinner's Friend and Advocate, was portrayed as a stern inquisitor and judge; and the witness of the Holy Spirit was either falsified or entirely silenced, as best it might suit the masters in Israel and its afflicters. With this the well-spring of a holy love and godly life was, of necessity, almost entirely obstructed in its flow onward from the heart of God to the hearts of men—and that Heart so rich and full, and these hearts so poor and so destitute!

Besides, and holding pace with the spread of these heresies, life's orders, and these of God's own appointment, were deprived of their becoming sanctity. While, on the one hand, the external organization of the Church was unduly exalted and misemployed in many ways, the communion of saints, on the other hand, was entirely lost sight of, even to the idea of it. So also was the State most flagrantly profaned and its authority shamefully traduced. Between the priesthood and the laity sharp lines of discrimination were drawn as between a higher and lower order of beings. Marriage was looked upon as rather an unclean thing, and celibacy as distinctive of an extra purity and virtuousness. The time-honored offices of every-day life, the trades and the professions, were largely abandoned for a suspicious life in some cave of the forests, on a pillar along the highway, or in some cloister of the church; and theological study and research were made to give way to an interminable questioning and quibbling about small points of casuistry.

Were such the doctrines prevalent concerning God and man, and were such the principles in vogue respecting life and its ordinances, what was the practical reality and what the actual condition of things, especially among the masses, can be better imagined than described. Darkness again covered the earth, and gross darkness the people. It was, emphatically, the reign of darkness; the nations of Christendom lived in thralldom, and they knew it not.

But "behold, He that keepeth Israel, shall neither slum-

ber nor sleep;" "the Lord's hand is not shortened, that it cannot save;" "His compassions fail not!" With the dawn of Luther's day, God caused His own light to break anew upon the world. He gave the Word, and that Word not bound; and great was the company of them that published it. Ever since that day, in all questions of faith and life the inquiring soul is directed to "the law and to the testimony" (Isa. 8, 20; Deut. 4, 2; 2 Tim. 3, 16-17), and told to search the Scriptures. The bitter but wholesome truth is again brought to bear on men, that they are dead in trespasses and sins; and that in their wretched condition they are utterly helpless. "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? then may ye also do good, that are accustomed to do evil." Jer. 18, 20. Then were the glad tidings preached to the poor in spirit and to the broken and contrite heart, "To wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them;" (2 Cor. 5, 19), and, "by grace are ye saved, through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God." (Eph. 2, 8.) Since then, and by that faith, men are again engrafted into Christ the living Vine, and as branches quickened by Him, and purified by the heavenly Husbandman, they bring forth fruits of righteousness to the glory and praise of God. In a word: wayward and captive Israel was led back to the covenant made with its fathers, and began once more to realize the promise: "I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people." (Heb. 8, 10; Jer. 31, 33.)

Closely following and in part attending this gracious revelation of its right principle and real power, the true forms and the divinely appointed estates of a godly life were likewise set forth again in their proper light. The Church, the Bride of Christ, was rescued from the embraces of her profligate seducer, and relieved of the dross of her unlawful connection; and presented as a chaste virgin to her Lord, upon His right hand did stand in gold of Ophir. And the Bridegroom, in the joy of His heart and in good will toward His friends, was heard to say: "But be not ye called rabbi: for one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren.

And call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven." (Matt. 22, 8-9.) Nor was the beldam State forgotten in this good work of reformation. By the divine declaration again published: Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's,—a behest of heaven so old and yet so new to the ears of men in that day,—she regained her liberty, was restored to authority, and were the boundaries of her domain irrevocably fixed. Moreover, the heroic Luther and his brave coadjutors taught, as do the Scriptures, that marriage is honorable in all; they reasserted the sanctity of the home and of home-life: and in proof of the sincerity of their convictions they, in defiance of the corrupt opinions of their times, practiced what they preached. Besides, all manner of useful labor, life's varied stations, its divers orders of industry, the arts and sciences, had severally restored to them their rightful dignity, and were quickened to a renewed and sanctified activity.

From these, its main features, it may be seen what was the character of that ever-memorable work, which in those days our gracious God wrought out among men and by their instrumentality. If now we ask what was the result of this movement and what the principle secured to us in so far as it relates to our present inquiry and as it may serve us in answer to it, we will find it the following,—summarily stated, and with the Word as the only rule of life as its fundamental postulate,—to wit:

That we fear, love, and trust God above all things; that in this frame of mind we glorify Him and serve our fellow-men; that so we do in all those conditions and relations of our common being, into which God may place us; and that, in order to faithfulness in all things, we in wise measure husband our moments, our substance, our bodily strength, and the powers and passions of our minds and hearts. (See Luther's Explanation of the Ten Commandments, and his "Table of Duties," etc.)

They that are born of God are to live unto Him: if they are children, then as becomes a child; if men or women, then as it behooves their sex and age; if man-servants or maid-servants, then as subordinates; if master or mistress, then as they who have authority; if husband or wife, then as a lov-

ing and dutiful spouse; if fathers or mothers, then as faithful parents; true as friends, kind as neighbors, loyal as citizens, abiding in their calling and walking worthy of it; doing good as the Lord gives them strength and opportunity; and that thus they live unto Him as dear children, increasing daily in favor with God and men.

Such, we may say, is the view of life at which we have arrived by the Reformation of the 16th century. Simple as it may seem, it is, nevertheless, profoundly significant; and it becomes as difficult of application at times, as in its sweep it is wide and searching. Historically, as stated, it is thoroughly protestant, and we believe it to be as Scriptural, and therefore Christian. In every way, it merits close inspection on account of both the predominance to which it has attained among mankind and the supreme importance of the matter involved in it.

Life, in all the capacities men should live it according to the word and will of God, may be said to present itself to us in a threefold aspect. In its references, namely: first, to the nature and character of its subject; secondly, to its several institutions, divinely established; and thirdly, to the special vocation and employment followed by the individual to secure his livelihood. It will be observed, that these its separate and distinct relations are given in the order of their weight and worth—whether absolutely and without exceptions, we are not prepared to maintain. But to illustrate: a man may be a Christian, and the husband of one wife, and a fisherman, all in one—as was St. Peter at some different times of his life. Now it is held that the being a Christian is more than is a husband; and that to be a husband is more than a taker of fish. The first denotes relation to God, and at the same time expresses the highest quality of which human nature can be made to partake; the second denotes relation to man, (or woman, if you prefer it so), and presents an example of life in an estate of God's own institution and sanction; the third denotes relation to things, such as pertain immediately to our bodily existence, and hence are the objects of some earthly calling. Of an honest and efficient steward in the last we say, that he is useful and as worthy of praise as he is of his hire; to the loving and faithful husband or wife we ascribe

great worth, honor and happiness; but he who has the promise of this life and the life to come and for whom the highest glory is held in reserve, is the godly man—the true Christian, and no other. So there are, on the other hand, the sin of idleness, the sin of adultery, and the sin of infidelity: the one entails poverty and the like evils, the other God's judgment, but the last eternal damnation without all hope of escape.

In the order of gradation, as here exemplified, do the Scriptures generally distinguish and emphasize with reference to the multitudinous affairs of life; (as witness also the ten commandments in their sequence). The spiritual condition of man—or his personal relation to God—is set forth as first in order; then come the three estates, divinely instituted, namely the family, the state, and the church visible; lastly, following these and subservient to them all, come the various earthly callings or occupations. On close examination it will be found, as might be expected, that, as we thus recede from the highest and higher concerns of human life, the will of God becomes less profuse, definite, minute and clear in its declarations, so that in the lower affairs of his life man is thrown back more or less upon his own judgment and the pleasure of his will. Yet never is he left without some general principle and power from God to guard and direct him even here, if he will but avail himself of them.

When now, in the first place, we speak of life in its bearing on the subject-object of it, the latter comes under consideration as a man, as a sinner, and as a Christian or child of God. In each and all of these his characters and conditions, the subject of life is, under God, himself the chief object of his thoughts and cares and doings! and this to the end that the sinner may mortify and die; but that the man and Christian live, and so live that he grow from strength to strength unto a perfect manhood in Christ Jesus.

That, with this end in view, man direct his attention first of all upon his entire self, there are good reasons. His body with its members, his mind and heart with all their powers and capabilities, in so far as they are created by God, and considered apart from their moral condition, are good; and as gifts bestowed they are held in trust, because bestowed

not absolutely but for a purpose; they still belong to Him who gave them and who continues to exercise over them His sovereignty and care. But accountable for their use or abuse is above all he who indeed holds them in possession, but so holds them in trust for God. Then, too, is the entire man redeemed, and the entire man called to enter God's kingdom of grace and glory—so precious are even our bodies in His sight, that the Scriptures speak of them as members of Christ and temples of the Holy Ghost. 1 Cor. 7. But now, that I myself fail not of so great a grace, there can be no higher and nearer concern, for in this I care for self as an object of God's redeeming grace, as one whose body and soul are bought for His kingdom with the price of His own dear Son sacrificed for me. Moreover, man naturally loves himself: and this were not a vice but rather a virtue, would be but love himself wisely and well, that is, love himself as one created and redeemed by God and for Him. So God would have it; and on man's sanctified love of himself, He rests in part the entire 2nd table of the law, saying: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Matt. 22, 39; comp. Eph. 5, 29. Lastly, in so far as man is to love his neighbor and is called to be instrumental in doing, or in furthering the doing of, any good work, there is nothing which, in the end, will prove so utterly injurious to his part of it, as neglect and abuse of self. A whole and healthy body, and a sound mind well improved, are conditions relatively, while a good and pure heart is the absolute condition of perfect action—as God reckons perfection. "Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but every corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit." Matt. 7, 16. Accordingly, that the tree be made good will be the first care of every good husbandman: and we, to be fruitful of good works, must first of all give heed to our own condition. To acquit and approve ourselves as men and Christians, manhood and Christian character must be established in us. True, to do this is God's work: but that He do this work in us and for us, that we in no wise hinder His will and operation in order to it, is and must remain throughout life our chief concern. Unless God first love us,

we can not love Him, nor can we love ourselves and our fellow men. Except He serve us, we can neither serve Him nor men. Our fulness is altogether of things evil; of good things we are entirely empty; for "what hast thou, that thou didst not receive?" 1 Cor. 4, 7. We add: what art thou, in the matter of goodness, that God hath not made thee? and unless His strength be made perfect in thy weakness, what canst thou do? It is the personal and living relation between God and himself, whereby the individual's relation is determined to men and things about him. (See e. g. 1 John 5, 1 and 2 Pet. 1, 5-7.) It is by the God-given faith which justifies and regenerates us, that we come to a child-like fear and a trustful love of God, and these constitute the source and strength, the impulse and virtue, the very essence of all true life; for in them only and proceeding from them is all holy love of the brethren and of mankind. "Meditate upon these things; give thyself wholly to them; that thy profiting may appear to all men. Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them: for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee." 1 Tim. 4, 15-16. This charge of Paul to Timothy may be generalized, and will be found excellent counsel wherever applied.

Proceeding to speak of life in its relation to the three estates above mentioned, it may be well to explain, in order to avoid misunderstanding, that these are indeed substantially what in the old church language are termed the *Status* or *ordines ecclesiasticus, politicus, and œconomicus*; or, summarily also, the *ordo triplex hierarchicus*. But since very unscriptural and most pernicious notions have been and are still advanced concerning these divine institutions, and whereas such notions have found cover in these termini, it is better not to use them. They are favorite terms with those, for example, who insist that these three estates are but so many dominions and orders in the which, they say, God would have set up in high power and dignity a chosen few, while the humble masses are to find their happiness in rendering homage and obedience to them. True, there is authority and there must be submission in affairs ecclesiastical, political, and domestic; but yet not as every body may choose to conceive of, and to account for it. Never can the sum-total

of life in these estates be resolved simply into the two functions, the one of rule and the other of obedience, as the ultramontanists and others of like imperious proclivity would have us believe. However, what we here contemplate is a few words respecting life in its aspect of membership respectively in the church as externally organized, in the body politic, and in the family be it as husband or wife, parent or child.

To be born in Christendom, and of Christian parents, is an inestimable blessing. There is an advantage in this so replete with present and future good to the child,—yes, and to mankind,—that he can never be sufficiently thankful for. One so born may be said, with certain restrictions, to hold the triple membership just referred to by birth. That he is not cast upon the world as a bastard or foundling, but received into the shelter and care of a chaste parental home; that he falls not into godless hands but is safely bedded in the bosom of a Christian family and at once committed to the fostering care of the Church; that, when for the first time he opens his eyes it is not on a state of barbarism and anarchy, but the rather is greeted on all hands as a new-born subject and citizen of a well-ordered society—this and all this we hold to be infinitely more than to be born a king, and were it of all the earth. Wherever men are so born, it is by God's doing: He in His wisdom and kindness has ordained the family, the state, the church; whatever these are in virtue, He has made them; whatever of good they have to offer, of Him they have received it; and it is by His grace when our lines are cast in such pleasant places, be it by birth or otherwise.

But immensely lavish as these spheres are in their entailment of good things both real and possible, in the same measure do they impose responsibilities on all who receive, and on all invited to receive such benefits.

First of all should we, who are thus favored, become thoroughly cognizant and conscious of the sacred nature of the several bodies in which we find ourselves as members, as also of the supreme importance of those affairs which enter into their composition. As we proceed in this, we should gratefully accept the blessings therein offered us, put to good

use our privileges, and cheerfully assume the discharge of such obligations as fall to our share. To learn, and to learn from the Bible, what it signifies to be membered on earth as well as in heaven with God's people, and what is the purport of citizenship under our own government and of membership in one's own household, and then to practice what has thus been learned: such is one way of making ourselves really and widely useful, and goes far toward filling the measure of our days with fruits acceptable to our good Master. A faithful church-member, citizen, husband, wife, parent, son, daughter, domestic—such are epitaphs worthy of our higher aspirations, and of our best efforts as well.

As pointed out, some people are, so to speak, born into the happy life-relations under consideration; at least, they are born into a relation of some sort to them all, while into places in them more closely defined they are otherwise introduced. Now as such youthful members of the church and state, as well as of the household, grow up in years and arrive at a consciousness of themselves in any such capacity, their situation in any or all of these holy stations becomes a matter for personal approval or disapproval. They are called on to say whether they are satisfied with the relations into which others have placed them, and whether they will confirm what others have done in their behalf. Moreover must they decide whether they will continue in the course, on which their feet are set, and advance in it to other and higher positions. That many, as soon as they are free to act in such matters, ruthlessly sever the ties which have held them to the home and to the church of their youth, and look with disdain on the land of their birth—such are occurrences which have become frightfully common in our time, notwithstanding they are atrociously criminal. Such actions are insolent in the extreme, and exhibit an open contempt for those holy ordinances which God has instituted to secure our common well-being.

Whatever may be the view taken of it among men, before God it is not a matter left to the arbitrary will of man whether or not he will be, and will act the part of, a church-member, a citizen, a husband, a father, etc. In things of so holy and weighty a nature, no one is permitted to be his own arbiter. There is a blessing offered to the individual and

enclosed for our race in each and all of these relations of God's appointment; and it seems to us the most glaring self-conceit and the basest ingratitude, either frivously or wilfully to reject the tendered boon.

That the Church, also on the side of its essential external constitution, is God's own creation; that there is no power but of God, and that the powers that be are ordained of God; and then, that God Himself has instituted holy marriage—such are facts so entirely self-evident, that in the Scriptures themselves but little is said about them by way of enunciation. To whatever of commands and promises, of exhortation and comfort is found in the Bible with reference to these estates, the fundamental and antecedent truth is, that such estates are divinely ordained. But the postulate of their divine establishment implies that man, for whose sole benefit they are so established, enter and live in these estates. In other words: the will of God is that men be or become church-members, citizens, husbands and fathers; and this again means, that men, to conform their will to the will of God, should desire to be and become what God would have them be. Such is the rule; and if there be any exceptions to it, as exceptions there are, these must find their justification in the will of God, never in the will of man as apart from or opposed to the divine will. When, for example, in the judgment of St. Paul, he that giveth his own virgin in marriage doeth well, but he that giveth her not in marriage shall do better (1 Cor. 7, 38); and when he would that all men were as himself in this matter (v. 7), he speaks conditionally (compare verses 7, 9, 17, 26-28), substantiating that there may be exceptions, and hinting of what nature these may be. The facts remain that, God creating man, "male and female created He them," (Gen. 1, 27.) and that He has implanted and will sanctify and bless their mutual love; (ib. v. 28.) as also does His Word still abide: "It is not good that the man should be alone: I will make him an help meet for him." (Gen. 2, 18.) Generally we conclude that it is God's good and gracious will that we cheerfully avail ourselves of all the privileges He offers us in the three estates of His own appointment, and that we faithfully do such duties as devolve on us in connection with them.

Subordinate to these general forms of existence in which men are called of God to live and move, and subservient to these forms, there are the various special callings of the individual. While these are all, a few excepted, of man's own invention, yet are they sanctioned by God. Any employment or occupation which is as such not divinely approved, is not to be reckoned among the legitimate callings: is in fact no calling at all; for, in the mind of the Christian at least, whatever he engages to do is to him the work of his calling only then when he knows that God would have him do it.

But can he have a certain knowledge in this matter? That is the question; and resolving it, he may ask: am I really to work at all? and if, what is work? and then, which is the work intended for my doing?

In answer to the first of these queries, the Scriptures are very decided in their utterances. In the state of his created integrity, the dominion over the earth was given to man, and he was charged to subdue it (Gen. 1, 28); but when sin had come in, the earth was cursed on account of it, while to the sinner himself God said: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground (Gen. 3, 17-19); in the process of his restoration now, the God of his salvation has indeed removed from him labor as a curse and burden, but as a blessing and pleasure to him He would have it remain. (1 Thess. 4, 11-12; Eph. 4, 28. and 6, 6.) Neither do we find that the Scriptures anywhere discriminate in this matter, as, for example, between rich and poor, high and low, master and servant; the command is rather categorical: If any will not work, neither let him eat. 2 Thess. 3, 11. For would-be consumers only, the Bible will have no room among men. Idleness as proceeding from indolence is a sin of a grievous and pernicious character. The lazy man is a thief of time (*Tagdieb*), talents and opportunities such as really belong to God, and of which mankind, the steward of them included, is to have the usufruct by the very terms of the trust by which they are held.

What are the signatures of work in itself and properly so designated, is to be determined rather from the cause and effect of it than from its form and nature. It is not an end in itself, but a means to some end. It is enough to know

that God our Creator in His wisdom and goodness will have it, and that our entire constitution requires it, that we employ the powers of our whole being; and when we do this—it matters not in which of the numberless branches of human industry—with usefulness to men and in praise to God, we work. “Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God. Give no occasion of stumbling, either to Jews, or to Greeks, or to the church of God: even as I also please all men in all things, not seeking mine own profit, but the profit of many, that they may be saved. Be ye imitators of me, even as I also am of Christ.” 1 Cor. 10, 31-33. Whether, accordingly, the buffoon, the speculator, the professional beggar, the proprietor of a tippling-house, the unscrupulous fictionist, the quack, and others of like character, may be said to be workers, it is not difficult to make out.

Knowing how to distinguish real work from such as may have the semblance of it but lacks all its qualities, it remains for the individual to determine which of its many kinds is to be the ordinary work of his life; in other words, to make choice of his calling. In order to do this the Word of God gives him no direct information, for reasons quite obvious. But there are given him general principles which will, if conscientiously followed, guard and guide him in the right while he makes his choice. These are partly of a negative and partly of a positive nature.

Sloth and covetousness are everywhere condemned in the Scriptures; he, therefore, who is actuated by such ruling passions as the love of ease and the love of money, is more likely to miss than to meet the calling intended for him. The young man who starts out in life with the notion of little work and big pay is apt to fail; and if he does succeed, it is from an impure heart, and his success is not real. Does the world pronounce him a child of fortune, do not envy him; “fret not thyself because of him who prospereth in his way, . . . those that wait upon the Lord, they shall inherit the earth.” Ps. 37, 7 etc. The rule is, “The soul of the sluggard desireth, and hath nothing: but the soul of the diligent shall be made fat” (Prov. 13, 4); and “they that will be rich, fall into temptation, and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition.

For the love of money is the root of all evil: which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows. But thou, O man of God, flee these things." (1 Tim. 6, 9-11). No better than the lover of ease and money will he fare who desires the pleasures and the honors of this life, and with a view to these makes choice of his calling. "For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world. And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof; but he that doeth the will of God abideth forever." 1 John 2, 16-17. In whatsoever things we would wish to know and do the will of our Father in heaven, we must in no wise consult our own "flesh and blood"—in these is the divine will not revealed. (Comp. Gal. 1, 15-16.)

No, not in his flesh and blood; and yet does God nowhere speak so plainly in reference to the matter before us, as He does in and through the natural parts of him whose vocation is to be ascertained, so that the first among the positive rules is that of actual and potential natural fitness. I can be called to do only that for which my Master gives me the ability of body, mind and soul necessary for its performance. It is not said that he who has the muscles for it, must become an iron-smith; but no one is called to wield the sledge unless he have the arm to do it. Not every one of glib tongue is to be a preacher; but that the tongue-tied is not so called, will be generally admitted. None will assert that the naturally foolish are to be teachers of wisdom—none whatever, except it be the toolish themselves, and therein we see the folly of the proposition. Then too is the voice of the heart to be heard. True, we at times meet with a repugnance to one or the other of the callings which is wholly unreasonable and quite sinful; but from this we must distinguish such inclinations as are inborn, and of which we cannot say that they oppose the divine will; hence, in so far as such predispositions admit of sanctification, they should not be suppressed but be allowed to cast their vote in the election. The rule here set forth is thoroughly scriptural; for St. Peter writes: As every man has received the gift, even so minister the same one to another, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God.

If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God; if any man minister, let him do it as of the ability which God giveth: that God in all things may be glorified through Jesus Christ; to whom be praise and dominion for ever and ever. Amen! I. 4, 10-11.

But other questions may arise in this connection, and to which no answer is given in what has been said thus far. What if a man's powers and gifts fit him, as is often the case, for the work of several callings and he have no decided preference for either, so that he is in doubt as to which he should apply himself? Here let him remember that throughout the whole of his quest he is to seek the wisdom of God and hearken to the counsel of his elders, especially of his parents. "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him." James 1, 5. Prov. 2, 10, etc. "The way of the fool is right in his own eyes: but he that hearkeneth unto counsel is wise." Prov. 12, 15 (and the 4th commandment). It is a part of the wisdom so acquired that he note the relative usefulness of the callings and the comparative want of laborers in one or the other of them. If he finds that there is no room for him in the one of his first choice, the very fact may indicate that he should turn to the second. Were the desire uppermost in the hearts of men to be useful to God and men, then would the vineyard of the Lord not want for laborers, and then should no work of life suffer neglect. Here, as elsewhere, it is the arbitrary and selfish will of men which hinders the will of God that would bless us and prosper us in all good things. Then there is still another circumstance in which the will of God may be read. Occasionally the heart of a youth is set on a certain profession or art which requires years of expensive preparation of him who would labor in it. But the young aspirant may be destitute of the necessary means, and parents or brothers and sisters may depend on him for immediate support besides. In such a case again should he reveal his cause to good Christian men and prayerfully commit it unto God. He who made little David, the son of Jesse and his shepherd both, king over all Israel, has ways and means in abundance to grant the desires of His children whenever He will; and

His will is always right and good. Therefore, "Delight thyself also in the Lord; and He shall give thee the desires of thine heart. Commit thy way unto the Lord; trust also in Him; and He shall bring it to pass." Ps. 37, 4-5.

It remains to give some attention to the closing part of our proposition, to wit: that, in order to faithfulness in all things, we in wise measure husband our moments, our substance, our bodily strength, as also the powers and passions of our minds and hearts.—Here, to avoid the meshes of casuistry as much as possible, there can be room only for a few general observations.

However manifold in its conditions, orders and modes, life presents itself to us when viewed on the side of its heavenly and of its earthly vocations, there should be harmony and no division between its many interests. This unity of spirit and of purpose in life, St. Paul points out, when he writes, 1 Cor. 12, 4-7: Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord. And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all. But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal." Since the one God has made me a human being and a Christian; and since He has called me to be a husband and father, a church-member and citizen; and since He has placed me among those of my kind and will have me to serve them in useful labor, it follows that there is not to be, and that there need not be, any real conflict between these several capacities of my being and doing. But that is not all: it furthermore follows, that I am to devote a certain measure of my time, my thoughts, and my means both in preparation for, and in living out, these conditions of God's own ordering. Were such not the case, God would not have placed me as He did.—And that God has so placed him, that is an assurance which the Christian must not lack in any of his situations, and a strength and comfort he should not want to be without for all the world.

How much of his time, for example, the Christian should set apart for things heavenly, and how much for things earthly; what measure of interest he should take in the affairs respectively of the Church and the State; how much

of his personal attention belongs to his family, and how much to his business; in what ratio he should use his money on himself and on others—such are a few out of a thousand similar questions, the exact answers to which must ultimately be left to the conscience of the individual concerned in them. But when the conscience is bound up in the Word of God, he will not fail to see and do what is right. That there is so much transgression in this respect, is due not so often to a lack of knowledge as to perversity of will. And yet the want of adequate knowledge, of the right circumspection and thoughtfulness has much to do with it. What makes so many parents, fond Christian parents, stint their children in the matter of education? They will tell you that for their station of life, their daughters have learned enough, never thinking that these have a right to things the highest attainable; they will tell you, that for a farmer or for a mechanic their sons knew enough, and while they are too short-sighted to see the advantage of a good education in all the departments of labor, they forget besides that by the goodness and grace of God their sons are called to be, not farmers or mechanics only, but men and Christians, church-members and citizens, etc., and that for these their high callings no education can be too thorough and good. So too it may be only thoughtlessness in the professional man who is always "at his books," so that he is seen by his family only at meal-time, and by the outside world once a year, perhaps. But such habits are sinful, and of such sins the world is full.

As we should apply ourselves and our means to the various spheres of our lives in a measure righteously proportioned, so should we husband also especially the strength of our bodies and minds by means of the necessary rest and re-creation. Of these last we shall speak here only in so far as they are common privileges and duties. There is need of this, whether it be that men have lost the knowledge of, or the belief in, rest and recreation in these their particular aspects, we know not. In these our times of rush and push, the person caught at home with his hands folded, or out of doors in search of diversion, is at once put under the ban of suspicion by some good people. He who sleeps but four out of the twenty-four hours of the day is generally held in

higher esteem than he who ventures to take seven or nine hours of sleep. The quicker a man spends himself—we should say, wastes or murders himself—in the struggle of life, the greater is his praise in some quarters. The good Lord and alwise Creator seems to have made a mistake when He ordained the succession of day and night, of labor and rest; and that man and beast are so constituted by Him, that weariness and weakness will creep into all the parts of their being, that some people regret as the greater blunder of the two. It is related of a certain historian—by his admirers, of course—that to banish sleep at late hours he would plunge his feet into cold water. In our humble judgment, neither the man nor his work are any the better for such open violation of the laws of nature and of nature's God.

What may properly constitute a day's work, a night's rest, and how many hours may be taken for recreation and diversion, about that there may be some difference of opinion; but there is none about the need of either of them in some measure; and there should be none about each one of them being a duty. He who wastes his time and talents in wilful idleness, sins; but so does he who, in injury to himself and others, deprives himself of such rest and recuperation as he may stand in need of in mind and body. The command: "Six days thou shalt do thy work, and on the seventh day thou shalt rest: that thine ox and thine ass may rest, and the son of thine handmaid, and the stranger, may be refreshed"—Exod. 23, 12—has not lost its moral for any one.

We of course here speak of these things with respect to life in its ordinary condition and movement; what may be done under the stress of extraordinary circumstances, is another matter entirely. I am entitled to my night's rest; but not, when a sick friend needs my services. When the bells of my church call me to the house of God, I should go; but if at the same moment my neighbor raises the alarm that his house is on fire, I better stay to help him in his distress. On account of the negligent and lazy in the world, the dutiful and industrious will ever be required to put in an extra stroke of work now and then. The care of the orphans falls to the lot of the fathers and mothers who survive. To save the life of another, I may be called to risk my own, etc. Moreover,

in speaking of rest and recreation, of diversions and amusements, we have in view only such things as are not opposites to, but correlatives and in part parallels of, industry and labor. Nothing is meant that is physically or morally injurious, but only such things as are conducive to soundness of body, mind and soul.

We close with the words of our proposition, rightly to order our lives it is necessary—

That we fear, love, and trust God above all things; that in this frame of mind we glorify Him and serve our fellow men; that so we do in all those conditions and relations of our common being into which God may place us; and that, in order to faithfulness in all things, we in wise measure husband our moments, our substance, our bodily strength, and the powers and passions of our minds and hearts.

C. H. L. S.

THE GREAT MYSTERY.

BY REV. D. SIMON.

There are mysteries within us and there are mysteries all around us; for whatever our senses cannot reach is a mystery. The mind that thinks, the heart that beats in sympathy, the soul that believes, the life that pervades our whole being, are all mysteries within us and may not be solved by such short-sighted and limited beings as we are. True, psychology, physiology, philosophy and science in general have thrown much light upon our inner being. But so little is known, and so much unknown, that we can very properly say that we do not know ourselves. Self is a hidden mystery. We do not, and we cannot know it. We are living beings, but who can tell us what life is? Man has an intellect, but who can tell us what that is? Man has a soul, but no one can tell us just exactly what is meant by that term. There is life in the body, there is life in the mind, and there is life in the soul. The exact relation of the body, mind, and soul to one another cannot be determined. Each one lives, yet not independently of the other. Each one has its particular

functions to perform, yet there is a continual co-operation, and the action of one is in sympathy with the others. For example, the mind has willed to perform a certain action, the body is already set in motion to perform it, when the voice of the soul (conscience) protests, the body halts, the mind meditates. Again, the body has committed a crime, the mind is guilty, the soul is stained. The physical ear hears God's Word, through hearing it goes into the mind, and through the mind into the soul. In this way faith, an action of the soul, is awakened, and faith cometh by hearing. The soul is reached through the body and mind.

Now these are facts respecting the activity of body, mind, and soul, but they fail to reveal to us their nature. True, when asked what is the nature of the body, we say it is physical, or when asked respecting the nature of the mind or soul, we say it is spiritual. The definitions, however, do not make the matter any clearer, the definitions presenting more difficulties than the words defined. Man is truly, and must ever remain a mystery to himself.

The world in which we live is itself a grand mystery. Geologists have attempted to "discover the foundations thereof" but they have not yet quite reached the centre of the earth! They admit that the distance to the earth's centre is about four thousand miles. Into this immense thickness they have penetrated not quite one mile. The formations of the other three thousand nine hundred and ninety nine miles remain a mystery even to the profoundest geologist. And these great thinkers, as they profess to be, want to know more about the world than the Almighty God who called the very elements into existence by the power of His Word! The truth of it is that geology knows comparatively nothing about the formations of the earth, and absolutely nothing of the age of the world. The earth is too vast for man's research. For every iota of knowledge there are ten million of mysteries even in this world of ours.

The astronomer, who has directed his attention upward, finds also that his mind is finite, he can go so far, but must acknowledge when he has reached a certain point that he can go no further. Instruments of wonderful magnitude have been constructed for the purpose of examining the heavens.

A good deal of information has been gained respecting the movements of the heavenly bodies and their distances from one another and from the earth. But much of this is estimated on the basis of uncertain hypotheses. Mistakes of some hundred millions of miles are occasionally discovered. What has been established as truth and been believed for centuries, may, by some new discovery, appear as a grand scientific error.

Moreover the more deeply the scientist penetrates into the heavens, the more does he comprehend his inability, for he becomes enveloped in a complete cloud of mysteries. New stars are discovered, but the more he discovers the more seem to be in the infinite beyond, not yet discovered. His knowledge is so very limited in comparison to what remains to be learned, that he is forced to acknowledge that as yet he knows comparatively nothing.

Man drops his eyes downward, he beholds the grass and the flowers and the grain and the trees. He sees these changing from life to death and from death to life, he sees them developing and producing each one after its kind, he investigates and finds that each plant has roots and that these roots take up moisture and nourishment out of the soil, and as a result the plant develops or grows. But further than this he cannot go. He sees there is life there, and he calls it vegetable life to distinguish it from animal and spiritual life. But why or how water and ground can develop a little seed into a beautiful flower or a little acorn into a majestic oak, are things as mysterious as the centre of the earth or the heavenly bodies. And who can comprehend how the same vegetable food and drink can produce different colors in different plants or even in the same plant? There are verily mysteries above, beneath, and all around us in nature. Who would not be induced to join in with the Psalmist in his song of praise to the great Creator and say: "I will praise Thee; for I am fearfully and wonderfully made: marvelous are Thy works, and that my soul knoweth right well." Ps. 139, 14. And even respecting the works of God in nature, we have reason to exclaim with Paul: "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out! For who hath

known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been His counselor? Or who hath first given to Him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again? For of Him, and through Him, and to Him are all things: to whom be glory forever. Amen." Rom. 11, 33-36.

When we enter into the sphere of the spiritual and meditate upon the Infinite Being and His wonderful works towards the children of men, we are completely lost in wonder and admiration. *Great is the Mystery of Godliness.* God Himself is the greatest mystery. Every attribute of His Being presents hidden mysteries. We know that God is all and in all, Almighty, Omnipresent, Omniscient. We can think of great power and extensive knowledge, but when we try to think out, or to comprehend the idea of having all power and all knowledge, we soon find that finite minds cannot grasp the infinite. What strange ideas come into our mind when we attempt to picture to our imagination a being that is at the same time everywhere, a being so immensely great that the heaven of heavens cannot contain Him! Not even the immensity of space circumscribes Him.

His creative power presents another mystery. The "things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." Heb. 11, 3. We can comprehend it when things are made of things which do appear, but when that which is not is called as though it were, and by the very mentioning of it, is called into existence, our minds cannot grasp it. Learned men have tried to solve the problem respecting the creation, but their learned treatises have only served to illustrate man's absolute ignorance respecting the creative power. The things created are before us, they tell of a wise and powerful Creator, but do not explain the process by which they were called into existence.

Respecting our own being, we simply know that our bodies were formed from the earth, and that God breathed into us a living soul. God imparted also to each creature the power to produce its kind. Even in this there is a mystery. How that breath of life breathed into the nostrils of Adam should give life to his descendants even for thousands of years we cannot understand. The fact we know, and that is all.

God moves mysteriously in the government of the world.

His thoughts are very deep, His judgments unsearchable, and His ways past finding out.

But that which interests us more than any of the mysteries so far mentioned is the *Plan of Salvation*. In fact all the other mysteries are only of comparative value. God's wonderful Being, His hidden thoughts, and His strange government of the universe, lose their interest and value to us as soon as separated in our minds from the Great Mystery, the Plan of Salvation. Who would care to meditate on God's greatness and almighty power, if he knew not that this greatness and almighty power underlie the Plan according to which God has redeemed us? What benefit could it be to the soul to dwell on the hidden thoughts of the great Ruler, without at the same time knowing that in virtue of the Redemption, all things, whether we understand them or not, must work together for our good! The Plan of Salvation is then that mystery upon which we love to dwell. It is in itself exceedingly precious to our souls, because it reveals God's thoughts of peace towards the children of men. Follow me then for a short time, and we will turn our thoughts away from things earthly, and envelop ourselves in the great mystery of godliness.

We know by revelation that God is just and holy, that justice and holiness are attributes of His being. He does not exist without them, that is, He is never unjust and never unholy. "I the Lord thy God am holy" is His own declaration. Holiness, however, excludes everything unholy and unclean, whilst justice requires the punishment of every sin. Now these attributes are perfect, as all things of God are perfect. It is therefore forever settled that nothing unholy shall enter into His presence, and forever settled that not a single sin shall escape punishment.

God's relation to sin never changes. The attitude He assumed against sin in the beginning is the attitude still maintained. "The day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," reveals God's wrath against sin. God's attitude to sin is such that His consuming wrath follows the commission of sin. The soul that sinneth it shall die, is God's just and unchanging decree. Punishment must follow sin, and this is necessarily so because God's nature forbids that it should be other-

wise. God's very being would needs cease to be what it is before it could be otherwise. To assume that God could do otherwise than hate and punish sin would be as contradictory as to assume that fire can freeze or that light can produce darkness. Such is the folly of those who assume that, because God is love, He cannot punish sin. God not only can, but in the nature of the case, He must punish sin.

Now all have sinned and come short of the glory of God. The sin that is found in us has stamped upon it the sentence of death: thou shalt surely die. By sin death came and where sin is death must follow. We are then doomed to die, because we have sinned.

But death shall not only affect the body. The soul too must die. The *soul* that sinneth it shall die. Although the word soul is used here in the general sense, embracing body and soul, the soul is at least included and therefore also sentenced to die. What is meant by the death of the soul we cannot comprehend, inasmuch as the life of the soul never becomes extinct. The better way to express the idea would be perhaps to say that the soul of the transgressor will die eternally. This dying is endless. The soul does not cease to exist and yet is dying all the while. The death or dying of the soul is an eternal death-struggle. Even the body, in which sin is committed, shall after the resurrection, being re-united with the soul, suffer these endless tortures in the flames which eternally burn but never consume. This is the second death. The death of the body, and the eternal death of body and soul, is what God's unchanging justice requires of him that sinneth.

From this it would seem inevitable that the whole human family must perish. How can it be otherwise? An eternal Being has been offended, His unchanging justice requires endless punishment, He, with whom there is no variableness neither shadow of turning, has pronounced an irrevocable sentence of death upon every member of the human family. How can they escape! How can a single person escape! The Sinaitic thunders and lightnings are ready to consume us; and as we try to escape, calling upon the mountains to fall upon us to hide us from God's avenging justice, we hear the demand: Be perfect, be holy, be righteous, in short, be sin-

less, and lo! despair lays hold upon us. God's justice as revealed on Sinai cuts off every comfort and every hope that might yet be found in the natural man. Reason and conscience unite in saying that hell will swallow us up. And surely reason and conscience have rightly concluded from the knowledge they have of God's justice and wrath.

Now God foresaw from all eternity, before the foundations of the earth were laid, that man would sin and hurl himself into this wretched condition. He did not however want those beings whom He would create in His own image, and for His own glory, to be forever banished from His presence and to suffer endless pain. In full harmony with His nature He formed a plan according to which man, sentenced to die, might escape the wrath of His own justice, and be made an heir of everlasting bliss. The motive that induced Him to form this plan was pure love for the human race. God so loved the world, does not only underlie the execution of this plan, but without it the plan itself could never have originated in God's mind. Love induced God to show mercy, led Him to form a plan according to which His justice would be satisfied so that He could remain just although the justifier of the wicked. If such a thing is possible, the attribute of love predominates in God's being. God is love is a form of expression not used in respect to the other attributes. He is not only loving but He *is* love. He is nowhere spoken of as being justice or as being omnipotence, but simply as being just and omnipotent. So to speak, omnipotence and justice are qualities of His being, and that, essential qualities, but even God does not affirm that they *are* Himself. He does, however, affirm that He is love. This might seem like speculation, if it were not that in every manifestation of Himself to the world, love is pre-eminent, justice being exercised only where love could not accomplish its end. Only when men refuse to be loved of God are they made to feel His justice. And even when His justice is manifested to the transgressor it is done to break the stubborn disposition and open the heart for the reception of God's love. Love underlies, and is interwoven with all of God's movements towards our fallen race.

But after all when we look at the naked fact that God is

just, we cannot comprehend how any thought of peace towards the transgressor could originate in His mind without doing violence to this attribute. The fact is however before us, and we can simply wonder and admire. The mystery underlying the plan lies in the relation between His love and justice, and although we may not dive into the depths of Divinity and search out this hidden mystery, it affords us exquisite pleasure to meditate upon it. Our everlasting happiness in heaven is founded upon it, and without it there would be no rest for us in heaven.

But the mystery is not only mysterious in its origin. The plan of salvation is itself so grand a mystery that even the angels are not able to search it out. Man offended an infinite Being by his sin and brought upon himself eternal punishment. Nothing could satisfy eternal and unchanging justice except eternal punishment, or its equivalent, infinite satisfaction. The sentence of eternal death can not be revoked. In the literal sense of the word, God never repents of any of His actions. The death penalty must be endured, and that by all, or that which is its equivalent, all must die in their representative. All died, that is, were made subject to death, in Adam, and as they could all be made subject to death through the transgression of one who represents all, so may the eternal punishment awaiting the transgressor, be endured by one who represents all.

But who shall this one be? Who is sufficient for it? Who can take upon himself the penalty of others, and who can endure a million of deaths, each one of which is to be of eternal duration? Every member of the human family has enough to do with his own sins, and each one must die eternally for his own sins, how could he pay the penalty for others' sins besides. Verily the redemption of man would cease forever if this were the plan. And yet man must endure the penalty of sin. Man must die, for man has sinned. The curse pronounced against the transgressor does not pertain to any other being. It would not satisfy God's justice, though an angel had taken upon himself the curse pronounced against man. The race that sinned must pay the penalty. The human race has sinned, the human race is condemned, the sacrifice or punishment must be brought or endured by that race.

And such is God's plan. Man must suffer and die for man's transgressions. Man is however finite and cannot therefore render infinite satisfaction. To render infinite satisfaction the one rendering it must be an infinite being. But the Infinite Being is not the offending one, and can therefore not as such be a substitute for those who have sinned. Sin requires the penalty of death, but God cannot die, how then shall He pay the penalty? It would seem altogether out of the question that even God, although infinite in power, could redeem us, since it is not compatible with His justice to render satisfaction for a fallen race in His own being, neither would it be possible for an eternal being to render the required satisfaction, because neither pain nor death can touch Him.

The infinite mind was sufficient to work out, so to speak, a plan in perfect harmony with His being, and that may be executed without violating any attribute of His being. That plan combined the finite and the infinite, the human and the divine, in one person so that the satisfaction to be rendered might come from the human race, and yet be infinite in its character.

God becomes man. The Word was made flesh. The second person of the Godhead descends to earth and assumes a human nature. His human nature was mysteriously wrought in the womb of the Virgin Mary. He came on earth in the usual order of nature, that is, He was born. His conception was superhuman, supernatural, for He was not conceived of man, but of the Holy Ghost. Coming on earth as a babe, He does not at once assume the full stature of manhood, but gradually develops, increasing in age, stature and wisdom.

The incarnation did not bring about any change in the nature of God's Son. He did not lay off His divinity when He assumed humanity. He did not cease to be God when He became man. He was directing the stars in their course and ruling the world whilst wrapped in swaddling clothes and lying in a manger. The incarnation is not in itself a humiliation. Not the divine nature of Christ humbled itself, otherwise Christ had ceased to be God, for immutability is

an attribute of God, and any being subject to change cannot be God.

The Second Person of the Trinity unites Himself with a human nature, remaining however the same yesterday, today, and forever. The Father and the Holy Ghost, although one God with the Son, do not become man, and yet the relation between the three persons remains the same as before the incarnation.

So intimate is the relation between the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, that they are One Essence; so intimate the relation between the divine nature and human nature in Christ that they are one person. But just as the three persons must be kept distinct in our minds, so must we not commingle the two natures in Christ. He is true God, perfect in every attribute belonging to the divine being. But He is just as truly man. Every attribute essential to humanity He possesses in perfection. He has a human body; a human mind, and a human soul. Being without sin He need not be subject to human weaknesses, and yet He is made subject to such an extent that it could be said of Him that He became like us in all things except sin.

The things which we would naturally attribute to one or the other nature are attributable to the entire person of Christ. It would for example not be according to sound doctrine to speak of the divine nature of Christ performing a miracle or ruling the world. Neither would it be sound doctrine to say that the human nature of Christ, hungered and suffered and died. It is the person of Christ, in whom God and man are united, that performed wonders, and that has all power in heaven and on earth. It was the same divine-human person that suffered, bled and died.

The two natures in Christ are even more intimately united than our soul and body. The human soul may, and after death does, exist without the body. Since the incarnation the divine nature of Christ does not exist without the human nature, as the human nature does not and could not exist without the divine. Even when Christ bowed His head and died, it would not be proper to say that only His human nature died. Death could not even separate the two natures. Not the man, but the God-man, Christ Jesus died. When

He commended His spirit into the hands of His heavenly Father, that was not His divine nature, but His human soul with which of course the divine nature was also united. When Christ died, the body in the grave was still His body and ever remains His body.

The incarnation was not undone by His crucifixion, nor was it temporarily suspended. Those murderers crucified not only a man, but they killed the Prince of Life and Lord of Glory. The body of Christ is therefore spoken of as the body of the Holy One of God whom He would not suffer to see corruption. God cannot die, and yet that cold and lifeless form in Joseph's sepulchre is the body of the true God. God incarnate could and did die; yea, that this might be possible He became incarnate. Truly, the person of the Redeemer presents a deep mystery. We know many facts with regard to this mystery of mysteries, but further than facts our knowledge does not and cannot extend. The same may be said of His marvelous works. That He opened the eyes of the blind and unstopped the ears of the dumb and raised the dead we know, as we know other facts of history, but the relation of cause to effect in His works we are not able to point out. How, for example, His words, addressed to the lifeless body of Lazarus, which for that reason could not hear His words, could call him back into life, may not be explained.

The person of Christ becomes of special interest to us when we consider Him as the Redeemer of the human race. He lived a human life for the human family, every breath He breathed, and every word He uttered, and every journey He made, and every pain He suffered, and the shameful death He endured, was not for Himself but for others, for man. He was appointed of His heavenly Father to be a substitute for the deeply fallen and condemned race, and after He had become man, He must needs be about His Father's business, and, as substitute, fulfill the law of God, being made under the law, and suffer the penalty of the law, being made a curse for those upon whom the curse of the law had been pronounced. The work He wrought, the suffering and death He endured, being for others, even for us, and this being done by our heavenly Father's will, and being but the execution of His plan to save mankind, we can be positive that *our* work

is done and that *our* death penalty has been endured. The Savior confirms this when, as He closes His eyes in death, He exclaims: "It is finished."

Because He was the Son of God this reconciliation is infinite in its character, extinguishing the eternal wrath of God, removing the curse of God from the entire human family. We are saved with an eternal redemption. Once for all men, and once for all time Christ died, and thus forever opened the way to the bosom of the Father, for God is reconciled with man. Divine love and mercy formed the plan, according to which divine justice could be satisfied and all righteousness fulfilled. In Christ and through Him this plan was executed; hence God can now justify the wicked and yet remain just. This is the sum and substance of all Gospel truth. It is the center of gravity of the entire Word of God. It is the fountain of life from which life and salvation flows to all mankind. It is the brightness of the Light of the world shining into this benighted world and into our benighted hearts. It is the foundation of our hope, the source of our joy. It is the key that opens the door of heaven. It is the food that nourishes our souls and sustains our faith in time. It will be the subject of praise in eternity. In this truth as in no other do we taste that the Lord is good. The words revealing this truth are verily sweeter than honey and the honey-comb. This truth is of more value than much gold and all fine gold. A thousand worlds were too poor to produce anything even approaching it in value. Eternity will be too short to express our gratitude and praise for the revelation of this unspeakable mystery.

This great mystery is not to be solved by finite minds. God's thoughts of peace toward the children of men are higher than our thoughts. It is something to be believed. The faith which embraces the great mystery of godliness must needs be an implicit faith, a faith that does not inquire into the "how" or "wherefore," but accepts it, and trusts in it, because the Lord hath spoken it.

The plan of salvation is such that those who believe in it are saved, and none besides. Christ's work benefits those nothing who remain in unbelief. Faith saves. Unbelief condemns. Faith saves because it embraces the great mystery

of the reconciliation between God and man. Unbelief condemns because it shuts out this saving mystery from the soul. Faith saves because it clings to that mysterious person who is the way to heaven, the truth that liberates the soul from sin and woe, the life that continues beyond the grave.

This faith is wrought in the soul by the same mystery that is to be believed. Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God. We hear the mystery proclaimed, the power that produces faith is concealed in this mystery, and mysteriously works in the soul the confidence necessary to embrace it. The Holy Spirit being the author of the words through which the great mystery is revealed, it is His power that produces the faith. But He is not only present as the author of the words, but He always accompanies His words and through these enables men to believe. The whole work by which men are brought to believe is mysterious because we cannot understand how words can convey light and life to the soul.

The mystery is all the greater from the fact that some of those who are brought under the gracious influence of the saving Gospel, come to faith and others do not. Some solve the mystery, and say God decided to save only a few and therefore exerts a saving influence only on a few, and these few come to faith because God wants them saved. This is however contrary to the original design of the saving plan, and contrary to the revelation of God's love to the human race. His plan embraces all, His revelation is for all. Preach the Gospel to every creature. God wants all to come to a knowledge of the truth and be saved.

Nay we cannot solve the mystery why the same influence does not produce the same effect in every heart, all hearts being alike full of wickedness, and by nature resisting God's grace. This will remain a mystery, but this we do know that those who do not continue to resist will be brought to faith, whilst those who obstinately or maliciously throw off the Holy Spirit's influence remain in unbelief and death.

But the great mystery, reaching the soul through a mysterious path, and mysteriously working saving faith in the soul, shall, after we have passed through the mysterious valley of death, open to our admiring view those mysteries

of a better life, which have as yet not entered into the heart of man, mysteries which shall afford us unspeakable pleasures forevermore.

"And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory." 1 Tim. 3, 16.

THE FUNDAMENTAL DIFFERENCE BETWEEN LUTHER'S AND ZWINGLI'S THEOLOGY.

BY REV. P. A. PETER.

When Martin Luther, at the Colloquium held between himself and Ulric Zwingli in the city of Marburg in 1529, said to his opponent: "Your spirit is different from ours," he touched the great, the vital difference between himself and Zwingli. This difference did not consist merely in the doctrine concerning the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the holy Supper, but in certain principles preceding the question in controversy; principles touching the supreme and fundamental truth, that God's Word alone is the rule in all matters pertaining to doctrine and life. Not the teachings of human reason, not the axioms of philosophy, not the declarations of "common sense," not the decrees and resolutions of Church Councils and the opinions of the Fathers of the Church, are to be considered as the standards, by which all theological controversies must be adjudicated; but the Bible and the Bible only is to be the sole authority in all matters of faith and conduct.

But it may be asked: Did not Zwingli also claim the Word of God, as his only authority? Did he not also defend his theological position on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper by producing passages from Holy Writ, favorable, as he supposed, to his opinion? Did he, in this controversy maintain, that human reason or "common sense" or philosophy, or the decrees of Councils or the writings of the Fathers are the

authorities to determine, what was the truth in the controversy in which Luther and he were then engaged?

It is true, that Zwingli claimed to stand upon the foundation of the Divine Word, that he professed to honor it as the only rule of Christian faith and doctrine, and yet, notwithstanding his claims and professions, the sincerity of which we will not dispute, the Bible in fact was *not* his authority, and hence his claims and professions were vain.

“Your *spirit* is different from ours.” This simple expression of the immortal Reformer strikes, as it were, at the very nerve, the radical difference between the two theologians. Upon the one hand Luther, with his conscience bound alone by the Word, without any subtle ratiocination and human speculation, reposes his faith in the declaration of His Lord. He exhibits the simple, trusting, earnest faith of a child, implicitly relying on the promise of its father, with a confidence, which cannot be shaken or even disturbed. It is enough for Luther to know, that his Lord has spoken, and in the Holy institution of His Supper tells His disciples, that He gives them His body and His blood. Not all the opposition of the world, not all its learning and philosophy are able to move him for a single moment from his impregnable position. With what holy confidence, triumphant assurance and victorious joyfulness he points to the words written on the table before which he stood: “*Hoc est corpus meum.*” Luther takes the Lord at His Word and trusts in it with unshaken faith, without attempting to modify his Lord’s words, so as to conform with the teachings of human reason and “common sense.” Although before men he is a giant in intellect, yet before his Lord he is but an humble child.

Luther was fully convinced of the supreme authority, the divine efficacy, the absolute perfection and the heavenly clearness and perspicuity of the holy Scriptures. Having found this immovable foundation, after having long and fruitlessly wandered about in the mazes of popery, he now takes the Word as his position against the rationalizing tendencies of the Swiss theologians and the wild enthusiasm and fervid fanaticism of the Anabaptists and kindred sects of that day. The mighty intellect of the great Reformer could have indulged in philosophical speculations with respect to

the doctrine of the Eucharist, full as well, ay, better than his opponents; but no, this must not be! God's Word shall speak and man, with all his wisdom and understanding, must be silent and bow before the Lord.

Upon the other hand, Zwingli in that memorable discussion at Marburg proved himself, (without designing it,) to be the forerunner of that theology, which, although professing great respect for the Word, really has no respect for it, inasmuch as this theology bows before human philosophy and perverts the plain and obvious import and meaning of the holy Scriptures by a humanly devised system of interpretation, which if followed to its final and legitimate consequences must inevitably lead into a dry and barren rationalism.

Zwingli's first argument against Luther's scriptural doctrine of the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist is indeed a masterpiece of superficial exegesis. Christ says in John 6, 63: "It is the Spirit that quickeneth: the flesh profiteth nothing." Zwingli reasoned thus: If there is no virtue or efficacy in the flesh, then the flesh of Christ, even admitting it to be present in the Eucharist, can not benefit the communicant. Why then should we believe, that Christ's body and blood are really present in this Sacrament? It is not the flesh, but the Spirit that gives life.

Luther in answer to this sophism of Zwingli answered in substance: First, that the words of Christ in the passage quoted above cannot possibly be understood as referring to *His* own flesh, because in the preceding 54th verse He says, "Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day." Here the Lord Himself ascribes to His flesh and blood a life-giving power. Then we must also bear in mind, that the body or flesh of Christ being united with His Divine Nature is very different, yea, immeasurably so from our sinful and depraved flesh. When the Lord says, that the flesh profiteth nothing, He refers to the flesh in which there is no spirit, such as our flesh is. This, our flesh indeed profits us nothing, for it does not comprehend the work of His Spirit within us. Moreover it is certainly blasphemous to say, that the flesh of Christ profits us nothing. Secondly. Even admitting, that Christ

in the passage above meant His own flesh, this does not prove anything against the doctrine of the real presence of His body and blood in the Sacrament; for if these words (the flesh profiteth nothing) refer to Christ's flesh, they might be interpreted to mean, that His flesh does not profit the unbelieving communicant, as St. Augustine has defined this passage.

Zwingli finding himself defeated by Luther, who vanquished him with the sword of the Spirit, the Word of God, now turns to human wisdom and philosophy in order to obtain new weapons to fight his antagonist. He raises the objection: Christ's body is human. Now a human body can not be in more than one place at a certain time. Christ's body is in heaven at the right hand of God; hence it cannot be on earth in the Eucharist. To this Luther answered, that man's finite reason cannot comprehend or sit in judgment on God's omnipotence. How can man dare to apply what are called natural laws to God and to His power and wisdom? Besides this, the right hand of God is everywhere, wherever God's power and majesty are present, by which God governs and fills all things. To this Zwingli objected, that God did not propose to us such incomprehensible things, as the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the holy Supper. Truly, a wonderful objection! Does not God propose to us in His Word many mysteries as incomprehensible as this? Are not the doctrines of the Trinity in Unity, the Incarnation of the Son of God, to say nothing of the many other doctrines taught in the Word, equally as incomprehensible and mysterious as the doctrine of the real presence? Yes, is not even the doctrine of the creation of all things an incomprehensible mystery to the human mind?

To the Donatistic objection of Zwingli: How can so great a work, as that the body and blood of Christ shall be present in the Eucharist be brought about by wicked and unbelieving priests? Luther answered, that this work is brought about, not at all by the merit or worthiness of the priest, but by virtue of Christ's ordinance and institution.

A third argument was advanced by Oecolampadius to the effect, that Sacraments are signs, that signify something, and that the body and blood of Christ are only signified or typi-

fied, but not really present in the Lord's Supper; surely, a very superficial view of the Sacrament. For whilst it is true, that Sacraments are signs, yet we dare not make them to signify anything different from what the Lord designed. Yea, the Sacraments are not *mere* signs or empty, unmeaning types or shadows of things absolutely absent, as the Reformed say, but are indeed veritable means of grace, offering, giving, imparting and sealing grace to the recipient.

When we come to take in at a single glance the arguments and objections of Zwingli and the other Swiss theologians against the biblical doctrine of the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist, we soon discover that *spirit* which was so very different from Luther's. Zwingli's theology is very plausible, but superficial and rationalizing, modified by the teachings of human philosophy and a very shallow "common sense," a theology accommodating itself to human conceptions and ideas, a theology which says: "God does not propose to us such an incomprehensible doctrine as this, that the true body and blood of Christ are really and essentially present in the holy Supper." Without being aware of it Zwingli departed from the sure and steadfast foundation of the Word, and wandered off into the labyrinths of human speculation. According to his theology, the Bible no longer interprets itself, but is instead interpreted by human wisdom, which thereby becomes the criterion for determining the meaning of the Word. *This* is the fundamental and fatal error of Zwingli, the *spirit* which is so different from Luther and the true Lutheran Church.

Thus we perceive the truth of the assertion made at the beginning of this article: the difference between Luther and his opponents at Marburg consists not merely in teaching differently concerning the real presence of the Lord's body and blood in the Eucharist, which difference indeed is a vital one, but in something beyond or above this doctrine, in certain principles involving the true interpretation of the Word. With Zwingli and the Reformed Church in general, the import or meaning of the holy Scriptures is more or less dependant on the comprehension of human reason. Reason, and not revelation, becomes the judge and arbiter on disputed articles of faith, and the sole authority of the Word is practi-

cally denied, notwithstanding all professions of honoring the holy Scriptures as the only rule of faith and life.

The Swiss reformers in a most arbitrary manner separated and tore asunder the Word and the Spirit, the sign and the thing signified. Oecolampadius says, that there is a vast difference between the *internal* and the *external* Word, and that these are separated as far from each other as grace is from the Law. The external Word merely represents or signifies the internal in the heart. This error of the Swiss theologian has been carried out to its final consequences in the vagaries of Quakerism, which have fully developed into a subtle, spiritualizing system of rationalism, without any means of grace, looking to an imaginary "inner light," which may be human reason, "common sense," or the fancies of imagination. Concerning the "spirit" we may well say will say with Gœthe:

"Was ihr den Geist der Zeiten heisst,
Das ist im Grund der Herren eigner Geist,
In dem die Zeiten sich bespiegeln."

This "spirit" may be tradition in one age, decrees of councils in another and "common sense" in a third, for each age may have its own peculiar "spirit."

Concerning this separation of Word and Spirit, as taught by the Swiss theologians, Luther says: Even renowned and learned men came to consider baptism as being mere water; the Word as an external human expression; the Scriptures as a mere external letter made with ink, and bread and wine, being made by the baker, were said to be nothing at all, but external and perishable things. And thus they all joined in crying: the Spirit! the Spirit must do all, for the letter killeth." So the living Word of God became a dead letter with ignorant fanatics, and what was called the "Spirit" became an authority beside, yea above the Scriptures.

Zwingli's fundamental error has been the fruitful source of numerous other errors. The Reformed Churches following his example, have developed a system of theology, as deficient and superficial as that which he exhibited at Marburg. We refer to a few points in Reformed theology to prove our assertion. Thus for instance the Reformed theology teaches, that not the body, but only the soul of Christ descended into hell;

that the Sacraments according to their nature and design are chiefly figurative and emblematical; that the communication of the divine attributes to Christ's human nature is not actual and real, but only a figure of speech, and the horrible Calvinistic error, that God's universal and gracious will concerning the salvation of all men (1 Tim. 2, 4), is in fact only the appearance of such a universal and gracious will.

In other doctrines as taught in the Confessions of the Reformed Churches we find a wanton, arbitrary spirit, tearing asunder and separating what God has joined together, as the Word and the Spirit, the heavenly and the earthly, the visible and tangible element, with the invisible and heavenly gift in the Sacraments, the divine and human nature in the one person of the Redeemer and the union of attributes in Him.

In the Reformed theology too much is determined by human reason and carnal comprehension, which would attempt to fathom the mysteries of the Christian faith. But as this cannot be done, because of the infinite depths of these mysteries and the finite powers of human reason, the truth is openly set aside, as in the doctrine concerning the Lord's Supper, or else the Gordian knot is cut by the sword of reason, as in the doctrine of predestination.

And yet the Reformed Churches publicly express a high regard for the written Word of God, so that for instance certain Presbyterian Churches will sing no other hymns but the Psalms in meter. Thus a Reformed Confession of 1647 publicly declared the Hebrew vowel signs to be inspired. But notwithstanding this professed external respect for the Bible, there is in point of fact but little actual submission to the Word. When the mysteries of the Christian faith demand acceptance the rationalizing spirit of the Reformed theology objects with Zwingli: God does not propose to us such incomprehensible things.

How different is the scriptural theology of Luther! The written Word is the only, the absolutely perfect source of all doctrine, as well as the only rule of faith and the sole authority in every doctrine. This Word is clear and perspicuous; yes, as Luther says, much clearer than the sun. The theology of Luther acknowledges no human authority as interpreter of the holy Scriptures, whose interpretation we are in con-

science bound to receive, on account of the infallibility such authority may claim, whether it be a single individual, as for example the pope, or a particular class, such as the clergy, or a local or general Church Council, or even a whole visible church itself. The Lutheran Church receives the Word of God, as it interprets itself (2 Peter 1, 20), and above all things rejects any human interpretation contrary to the analogy of the true Christian faith (Rom. 12, 7).—When we calmly reflect on the vast difference between Luther and Zwingli, as shown in the Colloquium at Marburg, when we consider the simple, childlike faith of the former, a faith resting entirely on the written Word, and then look upon the uncertain, wavering, doubting and rationalizing course of the latter, we cannot fail to perceive the truth, the propriety and the force of Luther's declaration to Zwingli: *Your spirit is different from ours.*

JOHN 6, 54.

BY REV. GEO. DILMANN, FOSTORIA, O.

‘Ο τρώγων μου τὴν σάρκα, καὶ πίνων μου τὸν αἷμα, ἔχει σωῆναι αἰώνιον· καὶ ἐγὼ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.

The verb *Τρώγω* occurs also v. 56: ὁ τρώγων μυν τιγ σάρκα, who eateth my flesh; v. 57: ὁ τρώγων με, who eateth me; v. 58: ὁ τρώγων τοῦτον τὸν ἄρτον, who eateth this bread; 13, 18: ὁ τρώγων μετ' ἐμόν τὸν ἄρτον, who eateth bread with me; Matt. 24, 38: *τρώγοντες καὶ πίνοντες*, eating and drinking.

Πίνω throughout the New Testament means *to drink*.

The sense of this passage is clearly shown by the context: v. 26-40, and 47-58.

The Lord Jesus is here instructing the Jews with regard to *faith in Christ*, who came down from heaven to make men temporarily and eternally blessed. Many of the Jews followed Christ and sought Him merely for the sake of the earthly bread which He had miraculously given them, v. 26. These, together with the rest, He admonishes: "Labor not

for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of man shall give unto you;" in other words, *believe in Him whom God hath sent.* He is the true meat for the soul, the bread of God which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world, the true manna, of which that eaten by the fathers in the desert was only a type.

"I am the bread of life," is spoken figuratively. The corresponding word "eat," whereby this bread is received, is also figurative. But Christ immediately explains the figure in these plain words: "He that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that *believeth on me* shall never thirst," v. 35. "And this is the will of Him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, *and believeth on Him*, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day," v. 40. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, *He that believeth on me* hath everlasting life," v. 47. *To eat the bread of life is to believe in Christ.*

But why does Christ add: "and the bread that I will give is *my flesh*, which I will give for the life of the world," v. 51? "Except ye eat the *flesh* of the Son of man, and drink *His blood*, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth *my flesh*, and drinketh *my blood*, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For *my flesh* is meat indeed, and *my blood* is drink indeed," v. 53-55. Why was it not sufficient for Christ to say: "he that *eateth me*," but so particularly: "He that eateth *my flesh*, and drinketh *my blood*?"

We have shown that eating and drinking in these passages denote *believing*. But *not every belief concerning Christ is true, saving faith.* Many, even many Jews, believe that Christ was a great Man, a great Prophet and Teacher, who taught righteousness and showed men the way of salvation by the exercise of virtue, and who sealed His doctrine by His death. The grandest thing which this class of believers can find in the Gospel of Christ is the sermon on the Mount. Such and nothing more is the faith of many who profess to believe in Christ. But such faith does not save, nor obtain everlasting life. Who eats Christ only in this way has not within himself the spiritual life which flows from Christ, nor will he be raised up at the last day unto everlasting life. No, we must

eat *the flesh* of Christ, and drink *His blood*, if we would have life. In other words, *our faith in Christ must embrace, and base itself upon, the great and ever important fact that "the Word was made flesh," and that the God-man, Jesus Christ, gave His body into death for us and shed His blood for the remission of our sins.* Who thus eats the bread of God, thus eats the flesh of the Son of man and drinks His blood, that is, thus believes in Christ that He is the Son of God, who by His active and passive obedience has reconciled us to the Father, verily, he has everlasting life, he has life in him, he dwelleth in Christ and Christ in him, Christ will raise him up at the last day, and he shall live forever.

This is briefly Christ's doctrine of saving faith, as contained in this 6th chapter of St. John, particularly in the 54. verse.

But now another question: What is the relation between this spiritual eating and drinking of the flesh and blood of Christ by faith, and the eating and drinking of the body and blood of Christ in the Holy Supper: *is it one and the same eating and drinking, or not?* The Reformed assert, that it is one and the same spiritual eating and drinking, as in John 6, so also in the Supper; every other eating and drinking of the body and blood of Christ besides the spiritual, by faith, is rejected. The Reformed derive their understanding of the Lord's Supper not so much from the words of institution as from the sixth chapter of John. See Ursinus' Commentary on the Heidelberg Catechism (second American edition), pp. 386, 389, 402. This chapter, they pretend, treats of the Supper. It was indeed not yet instituted when Christ spoke these words, but He had reference to it and prepared His disciples for it.

A single argument, however, is sufficient to prove that the eating and drinking in John 6, and the eating and drinking in the Sacrament are *not* one and the same. Christ says: "Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. . . . He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him." This eating and drinking *is always salutary*, and can not be otherwise; for: "He that believeth on me hath everlasting life." A warning against an unworthy eating

and drinking is not found here, because only the believer, who is worthy, can spiritually eat Christ's flesh and drink His blood. It is different in the Holy Supper. Here not only believing and worthy communicants, but sometimes also unbelieving and therefore unworthy communicants eat that of which Christ says: "This is my body," and drink that of which He says: "This is my blood," whereby they sin against the body and blood of Christ. "Whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." 1 Cor. 11, 27. Here then, in the Sacrament, the eating and drinking is *not always salutary*, but sometimes very injurious, by men's own fault. Hence we have here the warning: "But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation [*κρίμα*, condemnatory judgment] to himself, not discerning the Lord's body." 1 Cor. 11, 28, 29.

Therefore we justly retain a *spiritual* eating and drinking of the flesh and blood of Christ by believers only and always to salvation, and a *sacramental* eating and drinking of the body and blood of Christ, by believers unto salvation, by unbelievers to condemnation.

HOMILETICAL DEPARTMENT.

HOMILETICAL RULES.

FROM I. A. QUENSTEDT'S "ETHICA PASTORALIS."

Translated from the German by Rev. M. R. Walter.

I. *Never should the Preacher ascend the pulpit without thorough preparation.*

The ability rightly to preach conformably to the divine Will and salutary to souls is not the proceed of human industry, nor the result of any scientific research; on the other

hand, it is a gift of God and has its basis principally in Him, as Phillip Melanchthon rightly affirms. Nevertheless, God requires us to be diligent. It would not only be an evidence of negligence but also of audacity should a Christian minister presume to preach, especially with a grave, divine subject as the theme of his discourse, in spite of his being unprepared and not having first meditated upon his sermon. Concerning this, St. Paul admonishes, 1 Tim. 4. 15, when he says: "meditate upon these things." "The preparation does all," says Periander of Corinth. It is said, that the Athenian orator Pericles refused to respond to the repeated calls of the people, because, as he said, he was not prepared. When the Athenians once asked Demosthenes for counsel, he declined to give any, with the answer: *ou suptetagmai*, as he had not taken the matter into consideration. Tullius (Cicero) also says of himself, that he never ascended the rostrum without preparation. How much more should those who intend to enter the holy ministry, or those who are already in the office, deliberate upon this matter, so that when they are to preach the Word they may not presumptuously and thoughtlessly babble forth whatsoever may run in their minds and thus ignominiously dishonor, in the very presence of God, of the angels and of the Church, that most exalted office. Dr. A. Hunnius in his work, Method. Cons. col. 1039, vol. 3, says most tersely: "Those, who trust to their natural gifts of speech and babble forth extempore whatsoever comes to their lips, should verily be subjected to the severest censure, inasmuch as they in the presence of God, of the angels, and of the Church treat so carelessly such a grave and important a subject as concerns the honor of God's name and the salvation of men; for such godless and intolerable laziness they will one day be necessitated to give an account to the Chief Shepherd." Dr. Chytraeus says in the Prolegom. Rhetor.: "Some pulpit orators boast that they shake their sermons out of their sleeves. This folly and indolence should be beaten out with a cudgel." Sarcer says in his Pastoral Theology, vol. 43: "It is great audacity, indolence, and presumption, yea, a contempt of God and His Word and an indication that there can be no fear of God, where one has the time and yet does not study the sermon, * * * * and it is not said,

that one can substitute talent and skill, practice and experience; for be you as learned as you will, and have you preached ever so long, nevertheless, the sermon should be studied."

The sermon should be carefully prepared and assiduously proved in every part ere it be delivered. [*Cunctaque prius ad limana quam ad linguam revocanda.*] The better we prepare ourselves the more fluent and impressive can we preach. Gregory M. Lib. 6. Moral. c. 16 says: "The preachers should imbibe in quietude that which they are again to pour forth in their official ministrations." Erasmus, in chastizing such extemporizers, "who only then think of what they want to say when they are speaking," says in his *De Lingua*, p. 26: "It is frequently the case that those, who do not know before hand what they are going to speak about, do not remember what they have said, so that what they have spoken in an audacious manner they in like insolence positively deny." Again, on p. 71, he continues: "No one twaddles more in speaking than they who either do not understand anything at all concerning the subject of their discourse or have not paid much attention to the topic they are treating." "O blessed lips," writes Jerome, "which have never uttered that which they would have to recall!" In a marginal note on the word "understanding" (Rügliß), Ps. 47, 7., the sainted Dr. Luther remarks: "In preaching one should diligently and constantly employ the Word and not shriek and babble like the rude, uncouth brawlers and wranglers, and the shameless preachers who say whatever they may think." To issue forth a mass of crude and undigested material is not to be considered as something born in due time, but as abortive.

A totally perverse ambition pervades the minds of those preachers who without previous preparation venture to stand, as it were, upon one foot and preach off hand. For while such extempore rhetoricians "desire to appear brilliant unto the simple minded, because they, without preparation, *ex improviso*, can preach, they are regarded as simple by the judicious," as Quintilian says bib. 10, c. 7. Not unfrequently do they use as an apology for such indolence, or rather arrogance, the words of our Savior, when He spake to His disciples, Matt. 10, 19: "Take no thought how or what ye shall speak; for it

shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak." This behest does not require study, but promises aid; neither does it treat of the preaching to believers, but of the extraordinary confession to be made among the persecutors, as Theophylakt teaches, when he writes: "He bade them to be of good cheer and not to give way to fear; but when we are to address believers, then is it our duty to prepare ourselves, so that we may be ready to give reasons, as St. Peter admonishes. (1 Pet. 3, 15.) But when we are in the midst of violent multitudes and before kings, Christ promises us His assistance, so that we need not be afraid. For it is our business to confess and the way to answer is God's concern."

Some who are given to indolence, or have found pleasure in the society of tipplers, or are much occupied in domestic affairs, do not think of their sermons until the arrival of Sunday reminds them of their duty. Some give no thought to preaching until they are at the church, and then they boast that they can straightway shake a sermon out of their sleeves. This is godless, negligent and presumptuous. Surely, the eager and attentive hearers endure nothing more reluctantly than the lack of zeal in the preparation on such deep, all important subjects. He who is ready and prepared to speak is more welcome, being able to preach with greater alacrity and to produce a better effect upon the heart. To this end the God-fearing herald of the divine word first earnestly implores the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and then in good season begins to meditate upon his sermon and takes into consideration not only the theme and divisions of his discourse, but also the style, the sentences, and the words which are to be used. That which he reads gives him ideas which he can convert into new material and apply to the subject under consideration. Some apply that which they wish to treat of in their sermon to themselves and in an audible voice instruct, rebuke, admonish, advise, and comfort themselves. Others think that they have prepared sufficiently when they in their promenades think over the subject-matter of their sermon, arrange their ideas, clothe them in suitable expressions, but take no notes at all, relying altogether upon the memory; only a few approve of this method of preparation. Others, again, write down their thoughts and use the pen

vigorously; such do not fall into repetitions and monotony of expression. Of this latter method the second rule treats.

II. *The Preacher should write his sermon with his own hand neatly and legibly.*

If one desires to impress his sermon readily and firmly upon his mind, he should write it with his own hand neatly and plainly [*quam ornatissime, quam ordinatissime*]. Neatness in penmanship obviates vexation in reading; but order is the main support of the memory, yea, as Plato says, "It is its soul." Whatsoever you wish to entrust to memory, arrange in good order. Disregard order and your labor will increase beyond measure, and you will with great difficulty commit to memory what you will soon forget again. For, according to Aristotle, the memory easily retains that which is arranged in good order. Material indiscriminately and hurriedly gathered is the mortal enemy to the memory.

The servant of the Word should write his sermon with his own hand, for what one writes with his own hand is more readily impressed upon the memory. Neither should he write very fine, inasmuch, as age advances, the eye grows dim. He should also write carefully and neatly, so that he may read with ease what he has written, for what is scribbled and carelessly written one regards as hardly worth reading. He who is not mindful of his penmanship and runs hastily over the paper with his pen, fills a page with writing, but is scarcely able to read it afterward.

In writing sermons, not all observe the same method. Some prepare a synopsis in which they arrange in good order, first, the theme, then under the theme the divisions, not only in part but in their fulness, every specific division and subdivision, as well as the main parts, then also show by certain expressions the relation of the different parts to each other. This method Dr. Mueller recommends above all others [Orat. eccles. p. 52]. Others, learned theologians at that, write their sermons verbatim, that is, they write in full, word for word. Others again only note the principal parts of their discourse in the Latin or in the vernacular language, while the minor divisions they either do not note at all or note them with great brevity. Others strike a medium and treat the matter

upon which they wish to discourse in an exact method, yet in a concise form and at the same time summarily arranged. They note the subdivisions of each part, also, every point of doctrine, besides proof and illustrative passages from Scripture, and also add defining conjunctive forms, while the rest is left to meditation.

Dr. A. Hunnius maintains, that those who simply note the principal divisions of the sermon have not done their full duty. To write the sermon word for word is advisable especially for exercise; and to the younger and less experienced clergymen it is not only beneficial, but also necessary for the attainment of self-reliance, as well as for a larger vocabulary and also for the discipline of the memory. In this way the mind is occupied with the subject for a longer time, so that by the time the sermon is transcribed on paper, the subject-matter is also impressed upon the memory. Yet, I believe, that in the course of time, one may deviate from this method. The more experienced, who are well drilled regards the language and form, may, therefore, at times, when on account of extra official duties they cannot well do otherwise, note carefully the main divisions, the subdivisions with their minor parts, the Scripture passages, the illustrations, and other expressions which may be necessary in elucidating the subject. In preaching one should not confine himself too closely to the words of the manuscript, so as to speak with freedom, and thus be enabled in a propitious moment to select a word which will better enable him to excite or repress the emotions. Those who have by practice and usage acquired the ability of quoting Scripture passages correctly and in their proper connection, as well as the command of language so that they can readily select the right word, can save themselves much labor in writing. But they who, after the sermon is written, insert a sentence here and omit a sentence there, add a word here and strike a word there, and in their excessive anxiety are never satisfied with their sermon, double the labor of committing to memory, and because they unseasonably add figures and illustrations—which in themselves may be excellent but used and applied irregularly—they falter and stammer when they afterwards undertake to deliver the sermon from the pulpit, as Ursinus well remarks.

THE GERMAN PULPIT.

FROM THE WORK OF THE MINISTRY, BY BLAKIE.

The Reformation itself was the result of a revived Christian pulpit. It was the preaching of the Word of God that made the Reformers popular, and that roused the souls of the people. Wherever the pulpit was set up, the Reformation spread, and wherever the Reformation spread, the pulpit was set up. Where the pulpit was most free, and was used most vigorously, the Reformation was most thorough. By-and-by the Church of Rome came to see the power of this weapon, and from time to time she has used it, as a means both of producing a diversion from Protestantism and of extolling the authority of the Church and the value of her ceremonies. But her use of the pulpit has always been somewhat restricted—generally in the centres of intellectual life, among educated men who were becoming tired of her ceremonies and sceptical of her whole claims and authority. It is contrary to the genius of her system that she should place much reliance on preaching, or represent it as other than subordinate to the elaborate ritual in which she puts her trust.

The Reformation era was one of great triumph for the pulpit. Never was its power more conspicuously or more conclusively shown. The greatest revolution of modern times was in the main the fruit of this weapon. And if preaching of the Word had not forcibly been suppressed, if fire and sword had not stopped its action in France, Spain, Italy, and Austria, its triumph would have been still greater, and Europe, with but trifling exceptions, would have owned its power.

The preaching of the Reformation was a decided advance, in doctrinal clearness and solidity, on that of the fourth century, and even on the best specimens of the mediaeval period. Compared with the former, it was more clear, full-volumed, and definite—dwelling on man's fallen state, and on the way of salvation through the sacrifice of Christ, as well as on the scriptural means of maintaining the life of faith and holiness, amid the trials and temptations of the world. Compared with the preachers of the mediaeval period, the Reformers were more hearty, hopeful, and rejoicing. Living

secluded from the world, as even the best of the mediaeval preachers did—Bernhard, Anselm, and the like—and subjected as they were personally to a rigid discipline they were little fitted to proclaim heartily the glad tidings of free forgiveness; they rather gave themselves to probe hearts, to awaken pensive feelings, to wean from the world, and to urge the carrying of the cross. The preachers of the Reformation mounted to a higher platform, and unfurled the true banner, the real Evangel, the glorious news of the kingdom of God. In their lips the grace of God that bringeth salvation was no mere speculative dogma, it was the pearl of great price, it was the treasure hid in the field, it was the unspeakable gift of God to men. To press on them this grand discovery, to urge them to lay hold of this treasure and thus secure their eternal peace and happiness, afforded scope for the highest eloquence, and was fitted, indeed, to create an eloquence where it did not exist. There was thus a rejoicing element in the Reformation pulpit, such as had not been since the apostolic age. The ring of Luther's joyous nature was in it, and the melody of his triumphant hymns, in opposition to the minor key of many preceding centuries. It was genuine, hearty, earnest. It filled the world with its sound. Everywhere men were brought up out of a horrible pit, out of the miry clay; their feet were set on a rock, and a new song was put in their mouths, even praise to their God.

* * * *

It can hardly be said, however, that the German pulpit has yet attained a position corresponding to the extraordinary vigor and attainments of the German mind. We doubt whether German theologians have a high enough conception of preaching as the great method of advancing the kingdom of God. Should they attain to such a conception, and should something of the old earnestness of Luther's days come again into the German pulpit, the most glorious effects might be expected; the German Church might become the reviver of the Gospel throughout Europe.

FOR CONFESSION.

(Preparatory to Holy Communion.)

A.

1 COR. 11, 28, 29.

Int. Before eating of "that bread" and drinking of "that cup," *self-examination*. This is

- a) a church usage;
- b) necessary. A worthy communion requires truly believing hearts. But the heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked, who can know it? Jer. 17, 9.
- c) enjoined by the Scriptures.

"LET A MAN EXAMINE HIMSELF, AND SO LET HIM EAT OF THAT BREAD, AND DRINK OF THAT CUP?"

I. *The object of Self-examination is*

- 1. *To ascertain*
 - a) generally, whether we are really in grace with God; and, whether we have grown, and do daily grow, in grace with Him;
 - b) particularly, whether we have "truly believing hearts" such as are necessary to a worthy communion.
- 2. *To lead us*
 - a) generally to a more sincere repentance and to a purer and stronger faith in Christ;
 - b) particularly (in such repentance and faith), to a hunger and thirst for the body and blood of Christ for the remission of our sins.

II. *The rule of Self-examination is*

- 1. *Nothing human*, such as the character and the lives of our fellow Christians, or the sayings of men.
- 2. *The divine Word*; i. e., the Law and the Gospel.

Conclusion.—So doing, what do we find? What will we do?
"God be merciful to me a sinner!"

B.

1 TIM. 1, 15-17.

Int. St. Paul was not ashamed to confess his sins. Neither was he ashamed of the Gospel of Christ. He speaks of himself as the chief of sinners; but rejoiced all the more in that grace of God which bringeth salvation.

Beloved, we have come to the house of God this day to confess our sinfulness, our transgressions, our unworthiness, our forlorn condition—also to implore God's pardon, peace, etc.

Here is God's answer to our supplication:

CHRIST JESUS CAME INTO THE WORLD TO SAVE SINNERS!

I. *This is a faithful saying*—a saying which is $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\delta\sigma$, credible, true, sure. For

1. *It is God's own saying*; He cannot lie, cannot deceive us.
2. *A saying which God has verified*; “came,” i. e., Christ Jesus has come, has saved.
3. *A saying for sinners*; for all sinners, especially for those who know their sins, etc.

II. *A saying worthy of all acceptance.*

1. *It profits no one unless he accept it*; nay, more than that; who believeth not, shall be damned.
2. *It invites acceptance*; but only the penitent and believing sinner accepts it, and has what it declares: God's Savior and Salvation.

Conclusion.—How, by a full and firm acceptance of this Gospel we are made worthy guests at the Lord's table.

C.

ROM. 3, 23-26.

Int. 1. Though we are Christians, and though there is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus (Rom. 8, 1),

we are not perfect. No, our knowledge is in part, our faith is weak, our love is feeble, our worship of God imperfect. Our flesh still lusteth against the Spirit; we are daily overtaken in faults; we sin much, and we constantly need forgiveness.

2. There are those who profess perfection—their error and danger.

3. The true Christian says with St. Paul: Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect; but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus (Phil. 3, 12). Though not perfect, and although perfection is not fully attainable in this life, the duty devolves on us to follow after perfection. "Be ye perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect," says Christ. Now to further one another in this work of following after holiness, we will consider and lay to heart.

ALL HAVE SINNED, AND COME SHORT OF THE GLORY
OF GOD.

I. *You and I, we all have sinned, etc.*

1. Have we not made unto ourselves gods of wood and stone—*yet have we come short in devotion to our God.* (1. commandment.)
2. Though we are not given to swearing, cursing, etc.,—*yet have we called on God's name, as we should do, in prayer and praise?* (2. commandment.)
3. We have attended divine service—*yet have we been swift to hear the Word, meek and faithful in treasuring it up?* (3. commandment.) (4-10 com. treat likewise.)

II. *Yet we despair not, but we are of good cheer.*

1. *Because of God's grace, redemption, and justification.* V. 24, 25.
2. *Because of the faith God has planted in our hearts.*

D.

REV. 22, 12.

I. *Who comes, and what is the purpose of His coming?*

1. *He, the God incarnate, the Crucified—who has died for us,*

and gives us His body to eat and His blood to drink in the Supper—this same Christ comes!

2. *Comes to judgment.*

II. *To whom is He coming, and what does He bring with Him?*

1. *To every man.*
2. *His reward—as his work shall be.*

Conclusion.—What will He bring you? O, even now is the acceptable time; while He comes to you in the Word and Sacrament with grace, reject Him not, grieve Him not in any way. He is your Judge and Savior both.

E.

2 PETER 3, 18.

Int. We have come penitently to acknowledge our sins, and by faith in Christ to implore God's grace and forgiveness.

(*Remembering that this is the last day in the year—be it the Church-Year or the civil year—and that to-morrow we will partake of the holy Supper, should it please God to spare us, what can be more appropriate than a review of our past lives, a look at our present condition, etc.? Favored by a good and wise providence of God, we all have come, by one year, nearer to death, to judgment, to eternity! But)

WHILE WE HAVE ADVANCED IN AGE, HAVE WE ALSO
GROWN IN GRACE WITH GOD?

- I. *Our growth in grace is the work of God—Has He neglected us?*
 1. *No, He has come to us in the Word and Sacraments to further, to establish and settle you in His saving grace.*
 2. *No, in His kind providence He has made all things to serve for our good.*

II. *Our growth in grace is possible to God only with our consent and co-operation.*

* For 1 Advent or New-Year's Communion.

1. *Have we been diligent hearers of the Word and submitted to the Spirit?*
2. *Have we gladly accepted the rich treasures offered us in the Word and Sacraments?*
3. *Have we discerned the blessings hidden for us in God's care and government of us, and profited by them?*

F.

MATT. 5, 6.

Int. What the ordinary gifts of bread and wine are to our body, that the heavenly gifts of the body and blood of Christ are to our souls.

Bread and wine, however, will not nourish the body which is surfeited. Likewise the spiritual food can only quicken the soul which is hungry and thirsty.

“BLESSED ARE THEY WHICH DO HUNGER AND THIRST AFTER RIGHTEOUSNESS: FOR THEY SHALL BE FILLED.”

- I. *Who they are that do hunger and thirst after righteousness.*
- II. *They are blessed; for they shall be filled.*

G.

PSALM 51, 14-19.

THE SACRIFICES WHICH PLEASE GOD.

- I. *The Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world.* 13 and 14.
- II. *A broken and contrite Heart.* 16 and 17.
- III. *A Life of Righteousness to His Praise.* 15 and 19.

C. H. L. S.

PSALM 130.

Grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen!

You have assembled here in the presence of the thrice

holy God, whose flaming eyes penetrate into the most secret recesses of our souls and into the most hidden depths of our hearts. Before Him you would make confession of your sins and guilt to-day; and the whole burden of your iniquities you would enclose in the believing cry: God, be merciful unto us sinners! confident that God the Father will, for Christ's sake, respond with His own Amen to your prayer. Let me therefore show you the way to this grace: it is the way out of the depths of our own sins and misery up to the heights of divine mercy; it is an upright and heartfelt repentance, such as is described to us in the 130th Psalm. This is a litany which leads us down into the deepest depths of human sin and misery, but which at the same time shows us also the kindness and goodness of God, who, since we cannot in the least deliver ourselves, pities us in our helpless and miserable condition and in His own good time brings us certain redemption.

First we are led into the depth of sin's misery. V. 1, the Psalmist prays and weeps and wrestles (with God). That he only can understand who has himself experienced the like. It is true, there are things in this life, such as the anxious cares of a father, the pains of bodily diseases, the pangs of death, the fear of hell, etc., which at times lead the souls of men into deep distress. So pressed, many a soul has broken out in the words of the Psalmist: Out of the depths I cry unto Thee, O Lord! But the most real and the deepest distress of man is *sin*. Whoever sins, departs from God in his heart. But now, all have sinned. All men have deeply fallen from those heights of divine truth and righteousness where man was once placed by his Creator. (Ah, how pitiable, how miserable is man's present condition by nature, and by everything he can do and does. He is dead in trespasses and sins. Nothing is left of his former goodness. Nothing but a faint longing for restoration; and that longing not understood and not heeded. But God understands it, heeds it, and mercifully teaches us to understand and heed it; yes, teaches and assures us of His salvation.) Hence, v. 4, the sinner prays to God with whom there is forgiveness, and whose ear is open to the cry of the penitent soul. The all-merciful heart of God again receives him to favor, and lifts the sinner from the

depths of his misery to the heights of God's own blessed fellowship. Ps. 80, 4.

Whoever by true faith lays hold of this free and boundless grace of God, which pardons us without any work or merit on our part and wholly for the sake of Christ, he will understand more and more, how utterly sinful man is, and how unholy and vain are all the thoughts, words and actions of men, even at their best. He will confess with the Psalmist: If Thou, Lord, shouldst mark iniquities, O Lord, who shall stand! He banishes every thought of self-sufficiency; his only refuge is the grace of God which bringeth salvation by Christ Jesus. Such is the nature of that repentance which God works.

THE COURSE OF TRUE REPENTANCE.

I. *It leads down into the deep places of our hearts and is:*

1. knowledge of sin;
2. renunciation of self-righteousness;
3. prayer for God's gracious help.

II. *It leads up to the fatherly heart of God, for*

1. there alone is mercy and forgiveness;
2. there is constant help against all evil;
3. there is final redemption and glory.

ADAPTED FROM THE GERMAN.

PSALM 65, 3.

"INIQUITIES PREVAIL AGAINST ME; AS FOR OUR TRANSGRESSIONS, THOU SHALT PURGE THEM AWAY."

This is

I. *A word of repentance. Do not make light of the least sin.*

1. It is an iniquity:

- a) unrighteousness, a hatred and despising of the holy God.

- b) ingratitude, a hatred and despising of the *good God*.
- 2. It prevails against us,
 - a) here, in time; Ps. 38, 5,
 - b) there, in eternity; Gal. 5, 21.

II. *A word of faith.* Do not esteem sin as too great.

(There is no sin so *small* that *needs* not to be forgiven; there is none so *great* that *can* not be forgiven.)

- 1. There is forgiveness of sins. The son of man has power to forgive sins 1 John 1, 17.
- 2. God would also forgive you.
 - a) When thou art penitent, He will, etc.,
 - b) because He is gracious. Hes. 38, 11.

FROM THE GERMAN OF NESSELMANN.

ROM. 8, 34.

THE CONSOLATION OF THE REDEMPTION.

I. *Who will condemn?*

- 1. God will not (2 Pet. 3, 6), and yet He must if men force Him.
- 2. Men condemn, but should not.
- 3. You should condemn—your sinfulness etc.—but you will not.

II. *Christ is here,*

- 1. Who died for us. Not your *life* but His *death* redeems you from the condemnation of sin.
- 2. Who is risen again. Not your *death* but His *resurrection* is to you the way to life.
- 3. Who is at the right hand of God and makes interces-

sion for us. Not your *wishes* and *hopes*, but His intercession makes all things to serve for your good.

IBID.

PSALM 51, 12-13.

THE PRAYER OF A TRUE COMMUNICANT.

I. *Before Communion.*

1. Create in me, O Lord, a clean heart; my heart is unclean, hence also are my words and work.
2. And renew a right spirit within me; my spirit is not trustworthy, is boastful in fortune, despondent in misfortune.

II. *During Communion.*

Cast me not away from Thy presence; now, even now receive me, and grant forgiveness.

III. *After Communion.*

And take not Thy holy spirit from me. (Walk in the spirit—in love—in thankfulness for the gift received.)

IBID.

MATT. 26, 26-29.

Int. Take eat, *this is my body*—drink, *this is my blood*.

THE BODY AND THE BLOOD OF CHRIST.

- I. *A Testimony against all sin.* (To repentance.)
- II. *An Earnest of all sins forgiven.* (To faith.)

C. H. L. S.

THE COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

This Magazine is designed to supply the want, long since felt, of a Lutheran periodical devoted to theological discussion. Its aim will be the exposition and defence of the doctrines of the Church as confessed in the Book of Concord. Theology in all its departments is embraced within its scope, though for the present special attention will be given to the controverted subject of predestination.

1. The Magazine is published bi-monthly, each number containing 64 pages.

2. The terms are \$2.00 per annum, payable in advance, which includes postage. Single numbers 35 cents.

3. All remittances should be addressed to J. L. Trauger, Agent, Columbus, O. All Communications pertaining to the Editorial Department to Prof. M. Loy, Columbus, O.

The friends of the Magazine are requested to give such aid in its circulation as their circumstances permit.

CONTENTS OF No. II.

	PAGE.
1. HOW SHALL WE ORDER OUR LIVES?	81
2. THE GREAT MYSTERY	89
3. THE FUNDAMENTAL DIFFERENCE, ETC.	102
4. JOHN 6, 54.....	109
5. HOMILETICAL DEPARTMENT.....	112

Monies Received for Volume V.

C. E. Spielman, Revs. H. Wickemeyer, S. Baechler each \$2.00 in full.
J. H. Myers \$2.35 in full. H. Reif, 2 copies \$3.00. Rev. W. H. Price
\$4.00. Rev. M. C. Hecht \$5.00. H. H. Coffman, H. W. Rincker, H. W.
Roth, Thiel College Library, J. H. Spielman, D. F. Schuette, Lewis Heyl,
Revs. E. G. Tressel, N. M. Minne, J. Hoerr, M. H. Hockman, G. T.
Cooperrider, Geo. P. Mueller, L. H. Burry, A. R. Kuldel, G. L. Hunt, B.
J. Muns, L. F. Meyer, C. Noack, J. M. Koeplin, A. H. Bartholomew, J.
Bauch each \$2.00.

C O L U M B U S

THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

A BI-MONTHLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF
THE EV. LUTHERAN CHURCH.

EDITED BY THE FACULTY OF CAPITAL UNIVERSITY.

VOL. V.—No. III.

J U N E, 1885.

COLUMBUS, OHIO:
LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN OF THE OHIO SYNOD.
1885.

T H E

COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

VOL. V.

JUNE, 1885.

No. 3.

THE ALLOTRIOEPISCOPOS IN THE CHURCH.

(1 PET. 4, 15.)

Among the translations of this compound the following have been suggested and found more or less favor: one who (officiously) takes in charge the affairs of another, *Bengel*; one who concerns himself about the things belonging to another, *Berlenburger Bibel*; one who meddles in the business of another, *Stolz* and also *Gossner*; one who encroaches on the rights of another, *Seiler*; one who aspires to and lays hold of the things of another, *Van Ess*; one who is covetous of other's property, *Allioli*, and similarly *Calvin*, *Beza*, (and also *Luther* in his comment. on the Ep. of Peter, 1523); a covetous person, *Kistemaker*; *ein Vorwürtiger*, an inquisitive, prying or forward fellow, *de Wette*; a disturber of the public peace, *Pott*; one who arrogates to himself the supervision of things belonging to others, and which do not concern him, *Meyer*; alienorum appetitor, the *Vulgata*. Dr. Luther's translation in the Bible is: einer „der in ein fremdes Amt greift;” that is, one who interposes in the office belonging to another. The English versions are: the old and authorized, “a busy body in other men's matters;” the new, “a meddler in other men's matters.”

From these variata it will be observed among other things that where the translators generally supply, to complete the sense, such words as things, affairs, matters, business, etc., Luther has office. And this, as it appears to us, not wholly without reason. In the first place, covetousness and the consequent unlawful seizure and possession of other's things or property can hardly be meant here, for that is theft,

and is covered by the preceding *κλέπτης*. Nor can any general wrong-doing be intended, since this is provided for in the summary *χακοποὺς*. The fact that *αἱλοτρυπισταῖς* is preceded by the indefinite *ἢ*, *χακοπὸς* and is separated from it by an *ἀς* of its own, indicates that the former must signify a wrong-doer of a certain distinct class. In the second place, the notion of office is found in the word itself. An *episcopos* is an overseer, or one who holds the office of supervision; and in view of the scriptural use of the term, it suggests even the nature of the office, i. e. the episcopal or pastoral. Luther translates, not one who holds but, literally, one who grasps into an office; he thus makes the possessive *allotrios* not only to qualify office but also to determine the choice of the proper verb. The *episcopos* here is one who unlawfully holds office, because it is not his own nor intrusted to him; and Luther gives expression to this not in the subject but as in its adjective so also in its verb; and thus he puts the office where it belongs by right and not where it belongs etymologically.

However, whether we say with the German Bible, "another's office," or with the English, "other men's matters," it is evident that the Apostle has in view, generally speaking, a meddler; and very probably with special reference to one who intrudes on the official rights and usurps the official powers belonging to others. At all events this last is included in the first.

The sin here indirectly condemned is criminal in its character. The *allotrioepiscopos* is mentioned in the same breath with the thief, the murderer and evil-doer—*χακός* = bad in every sense. It is a doing of wrong which, it would seem, not only God and eternity but also men and time will avenge; a sin therefore which is sure to entail suffering, as do theft and murder. Let no man suffer as an *allotrioepiscopos*, says the Apostle. Inasmuch as it is an encroachment on such rights and powers as belong to others, the least effort of the memory and imagination will tell us how disastrously this sin has worked in the public and private affairs of men, and what great damage it may do. It readily leads to robbery and bloodshed, and is therefore with good reason placed side by side with theft and murder.

Of course, the nature and extent of the mischief likely to result from it depends largely upon the kind of affairs

meddled in. Where and in so far as these pertain to this life only, the harm done may be very great indeed; as, for example, when the ruler of one nation seeks to exercise dominion where another has been appointed to rule. But who can describe the injury done in the affairs of God and the soul? It is here where the allotrioepiscopos does his most destructive and damnable work. By his utter disregard, if not contempt, of the divinely ordered and the divinely sanctioned relations of pastors to pastors, of congregations to congregations and of churches to churches, he hinders the very coming of God's kingdom among men and works the ruin of many souls; and all this under the pretence too that he would save them.

In our exposure and condemnation of his evil deeds, we propose to confine ourselves to the allotrioepiscopos in affairs ecclesiastical. Now, in order to convict, we must first of all be clear and sure about the law in the case, at least in its general outline.

The field wherein the seed of God's word is to be sown is the world, says our Lord. And, in His institution of the Gospel ministry, the charge is given: Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature. "Hence"—says the fanatic—"my field, as a workman for Christ, is the world." The paralogism is not uncommon. To judge from the actions of some, it seems to pass and be made to pass for sound logic in certain quarters of churchdom; yes, and for sound theology as well. But do the premises given warrant any such conclusions, and these as understood by some?

According to the Lord's words, the Gospel is indeed to be preached throughout the whole world and to every creature. But His words do not say that any one who pleases may do the preaching; neither do they say that he who is called to preach, may do so where and when he pleases. It would be just as reasonable to argue from Gen. 1, 20, where it is stated that God gave the earth to man to have dominion over it, etc., that anybody is now entitled to pitch his tent on any spot of earth and possess himself of the fish of the sea, of the fowl of the air, and of the cattle of the field—just as the notion might strike him, and all this without any "If you please" to others. This, if we mistake not, is the commu-

nist's ideal of right and order. Have we, perhaps, also an ecclesiastical communism? The very fact that the commission given is in its nature an office, and that this is committed not to one but to many, is evidence that not every one is charged with it, and that he who is charged with it, because he is one among many, can not lay claim to the whole field, nor to any particular part of it, without let and leave of his fellows in the office. Of the Apostles, to whom the office of the ministry was immediately committed, St. Mark says: And they went forth and preached everywhere. c. 16, 20 Tradition relates that the Twelve, before they separated, had assigned to them respectively their field of labor; and accordingly the Romish church observes the annual festival of the *Divisio Apostolorum*, as also do the Hussites in Bohemia. The assertion, however, that such a formal division or allotment of territory ever took place, lacks historical foundation; and, judging from the lives of the Apostles so far as known, it seems very doubtful. On the other hand, however, from such information as is extant on the subject, we gather that some of the Apostles indeed worked side by side in the same place as, for example, James and John in Jerusalem, and Paul and Barnabas among the Gentiles; but neither history nor tradition records a case of interference by one Apostle with the field of another. Thus St. Paul says of himself: "Yea, so have I strived to preach the Gospel, not where Christ was named, lest I should build on another man's foundation: But as it is written, To whom He was not spoken of, they shall see: and they that have not heard shall understand." Rom. 15, 20-21. Comp. 2 Cor. 10, 14-16. Also Acts 14, 23.

Then, too, is it a mistake to argue from the Apostleship of the Disciples in its every feature to the Gospel ministry as this is now constituted among us. The two are not identical. Thus we find that, while the Disciples were immediately sent by the Lord and sent at large, the Gospel minister is sent mediately, and he is mediately called to a field of labor distinctly designated and more or less definitely circumscribed. The facts in the case, as we find them, are simply these: The Lord has given command to His Church to disciple all nations; to this end He has provided adequate means, bestowed the necessary gifts, assured the workmen of His presence, and

promised to bless the work of their hands. But in what particular order and manner the vast field is to be occupied, and the work is to be carried out—who, for example is to go to this place and people and who to another?—such are questions not determined in the text of the divine commission but left to the judgment of its trustee, i. e. the Church. And the order now established is that the call shall give answer to all such questions. The call is to decide who is to do the work of the ministry, whither he is to go, within what bounds he is to labor, when he is to quit one field of labor for another, etc., etc.

Hence we see that in matters of this kind there is, of necessity, a certain commingling of the human with the divine, so that we cannot expect to have an indisputable Word of God to direct and bind us in every question that may arise. But while men largely determine by their Godgiven sense of right, of order and of expediency which things are to be observed as right, orderly and expedient in the churches and their work, such human ordinances are not without God's sanction. He will have that all things be done decently and in order, 1 Cor. 14, 40; and to this end He requires us to render obedience to the ordinances of men, as elsewhere, 1 Pet. 2, 13, so certainly also in the churches.

Now on the subject more particularly before us the Scriptures are not wholly silent. With more or less clearness and directness they tell us, in part by precept and in part by example, what is order, and what is not, in the matter of a minister's vocation and its execution. Not only is it written: "And no man taketh this honor unto himself, but that is called of God, as was Aaron," Heb. 5, 4; (comp. Jer. 23, 21. Rom. 10, 15, and Augsb. Conf. Art. 14;) but in Acts 20, 28, St. Paul exhorts expressly, in speaking to the elders of the church at Ephesus: "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood." He says not, take heed to any and every body, but to *the flock*, and to that flock *over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers*, to feed the church of God. (Comp. also 2 Cor. 10, 15-16.) In the same manner St. Peter writes to the elders in Pontus, Galatia, etc., I. c. 5,

2-3: "Feed the flock of God which is among you . . . neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being examples to the flock." Here, for the words "God's heritage," the original has: *τῶν κληρων*; and this the new version renders with greater precision as "the charge allotted to you." Likewise Luther says: "Every bishop now has his own distinct parish or pastorate (bestimmt Kirchspiel oder Pfarre), which St. Peter, I. c. 5, 3, for that reason calls *κλῆρος* which signifies a portion, so that each one has assigned to him a certain number of the people. (Comment. on 82 Ps. Erl. Ed. 39. p. 254.) That, in this very matter, the Church has an authority which is divinely conferred and sanctioned, and therefore should be respected, is evident from God's Word. For since, according to this, the work of evangelization is assigned to her, since to her are given the priesthood and the keys, and since she is enjoined to prove the spirits and receive those who are of God, rejecting all others—it follows clearly and indisputably that the right and duty to call and employ ministers belong to her; and to her alone, because she exclusively is entrusted with the work and with all that pertains to it. But this right and duty of extending the call necessarily implies the other, namely, to mark out for the workman called his field of labor, and the work he is to do in it. The minister employed is not the lord of the people calling him,—that were a contradiction in the adjective; but he is their servant. "And ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake." "Tis true, "for Jesus' sake;" nevertheless, "your servants." 2 Cor. 4, 5. comp. Jer. 5, 31; Matt. 20, 25; 1 Pet. 5, 3. Moreover, he is the servant only of those who call him, and of none other. Without the permission of his employers he must not busy himself with the affairs of others; nor must he do so unless these call him to it. Acting contrariwise, he is a faithless servant respecting the church which has called him; and with respect to those who have not called him he is an intruder, not to say an impostor.

But what if the congregation itself, as is not unfrequently the case, connives at and abets such doings, or even directs its minister to obtrude his services on those outside of the charge? The question is so put as to answer itself; for although in that case the minister cannot be charged with

disobedience to those whom he serves, he is an intruder for all that. And this because his master is an intruder. The latter can give no rights and powers to others where he himself is without all authority. In other words: than its minister, no more has one church any authority within the bounds of another except such as this is pleased to accord to it. Least of all can it ever be right that one church by its own will and against the will of other churches, should exercise any such dominion over these as must inevitably lead to their destruction.

When it is said that the Church has the priesthood, the keys, etc., the meaning is that these divine gifts belong to all Christians, collectively *and* individually. Hence our Confession says: "Where the Church is, there is also the command to preach the Gospel. Therefore the churches must retain the power to elect and ordain the ministers of the church. And this power (or right) is a gift which really God himself has bestowed on the churches and of which no human power (or authority) can deprive them, as St. Paul testifies, Eph. 4, saying: When He ascended up on high, etc." (Art. Smalk. on the Power and Jurisdic. of Bishops.) But now the church is even where but two or three are gathered together in Jesus' name. Hence we conclude that every Christian congregation, because it has the priesthood, the keys, etc., has for itself and independently of others the power to establish the ministry and, to that end, call ministers. In point of fact, it is for this very purpose that Christians, who are one in the faith, come together and organize, namely, to establish among themselves and to support the ministry of the Word, thereby to exercise their common priesthood and put to use the keys given to one and all alike. In so doing, and especially when calling a pastor, it is both advisable and appropriate indeed for one church to seek the counsel and concurrence of its sister churches; but this is not a matter of obligation and necessity but of privilege and expediency. To elect one's own pastor is a divine right belonging to every Christian as such. Where one chooses the pastor for another it is done, if it be by any right at all, not by divine but by human right—the case of parents and children excepted. The same is true of Christian congregations. In these the divine right to elect

one's own minister, possessed by each and all Christians alike and in common, is conjointly exercised and so exercised upon terms of their own voluntary agreement. When Christians organize for this purpose, and when they thus cooperate in calling a common pastor and join in the support of his ministry, then a cleros or parish is established: a body complete in itself, having all the powers, the rights and the duties of the Gospel ministry, and a field of operation in all equity its own.

But what is of chief importance here, remembering the purpose of this paper, is, that we see clearly the import and the direct consequences of the principles laid down in so far as they have a bearing on the subject of meddling in ecclesiastical affairs. In view of what has been said we may, accordingly, lay down the following propositions:

1. *If I as an individual Christian have the right and liberty to choose my own pastor, in a manner accountable to God, then has my fellow Christian the same right and liberty.*
2. *If I as a minister of the Gospel am bound to confine my labors to those who employ me or who desire my services, then is my fellow minister likewise so bound.*
3. *If one congregation or parish can lay claim to a certain field of labor as assigned to it by God, another can do the same upon the same conditions.*

This last may be extended to a

4. *If any Christian synod possesses churchly rights on certain grounds, then do the same rights belong to any other and like body, having the same grounds to support them.*

The premises of these several propositions are considered as having been generally established by what has been said above; that being the case, the conclusions are true also, because inevitable. Accordingly it is presumed that the rules thus obtained will suffice to try any case of meddling in church affairs which may arise between the parties named, or if not found sufficient, they will at least be of great service in the matter. Those, of course, who deny the parity between Christians and Christians, between ministers and ministers, churches and churches, etc., as do the papists, we can-

not hope to reach by anything that may be advanced on the strength of the principles enunciated.

In conflict with especially the first of the above proposition there are certain methods of proselytism resorted to in these days of church-divisions, denominational rivalry, and dogmatical conflict. It is maintained that every Christian should be a missionary. This may be true; and is, if properly qualified and rightly understood. If the meaning is that, according to 1 Pet. 2, 9, all Christians constitute a royal priesthood before God that they may show forth the excellencies of Him who has called them out of darkness into His marvellous light, then it is certainly true that every Christian is a missionary. But in the minds and mouths of many people this is not meant. Their notion of it is that they are called to do all they can to draw other people,—be these Jews or Gentiles, believers or unbelievers, members of some church or of no church,—into their own particular denomination and local organization. Besides, as to the ways and means employed they are not over-scrupulous. Thus, “every man a missionary” turns out to mean, “every man of us a propagandist of our theological ism”—an allotrioepiscopos in principle as well as in practice.

When a designing priest and a misguided nurse have conspired to initiate into the Romish Church a child of Protestant birth by secret baptism, all the Protestant world is found to rise in condemnation of the act—and the indignation so manifested is just. But what if some Methodist nurse, e. g. brings all her denominational zeal to bear on the minds of children belonging, say, to an Episcopalian family, and thus alienates the young intrusted to her from the church of their parents—are such doings less reprehensible than those of the papists? Is this not a flagrant breach of trust and a meddling with the highest and most sacred rights of parents with respect to their children? Certainly we must so view it, and accordingly condemn it, unless it can be shown that the Episcopalian family have employed the nurse to make Methodists of their children.

Analogous to this, and suggested by it, is the case when schools under denominational auspices profess to give, besides a secular also a moral but wholly unsectarian education to

all who come under their care. Here too, unsuspecting and, we may add, indifferent parents are not seldom deceived. They send their sons and daughters away good Lutherans, let us say, and then see them return after the lapse of a year or two with nothing of their old and distinctive faith left in them. Possibly it may not have been by meddling that they were misled, but it is very probable. Apropos the query: When will our people generally learn that papistic ways and means are not wholly confined to the papacy, and be on their guard against them in every direction?

Zeal for one's faith and church is highly commendable; but it must be kept within proper bounds. When a person is found in connection with some Christian congregation and thereby has placed himself under the pastoral care of its minister, members of another faith and church should respect that relation. Though such a person together with the church of his belonging may be in error on some points of doctrine, nevertheless he professes to be a Christian and he is a church-member, and therefore not a proper object for the missionary efforts of those outside of his communion. These, though of the true faith, have no duty and responsibility respecting such an one beyond this that they keep open their churches to him in welcome should he want to attend their services; see to it that the confessions of their church are kept before the world, that books and papers setting forth their doctrines can be had by all who desire them, and then that they give a reason of the faith that is in them, when asked to do so. Whatever they do more than this to make a convert of any one to their own faith, is proselytism, is disturbing him in the enjoyment of his God-given rights, is meddling in other men's matters, and these most sacred in their nature. And here to the praise of our own people be it said, that while they wish to be let alone by others, they generally do as they wish to be done by. That these in turn are by others looked upon quite often as so much game for the net, is but too true. Among other things the writer remembers that shoes for the children, a silk dress for the mother and groceries at half price for the father were at one time held out to a certain Lutheran family as inducements for them to join the N. N. Church. The bitter feelings, the heartaches, the spiritual mischief

caused by such abominable doings only God can know; and He will avenge them, we may be sure. But in view of such things does it yet seem strange to any one that St. Peter puts these busy-bodies on a level with the thief, the murderer and the evil-doer. For the people it may be said by way of excuse that they do such things with good intentions but ignorant of their wrong. Not so for their spiritual guide who approves of it and leads them in the nefarious work. To plead ignorance for him is to admit that he should not be in the ministry. And yet there are many who, with all their professed love and sympathy, feeling of fellowship and respect for their "brother-minister" will steal from him whatever they can get. Such fellows are found to frequent the workshops, ostensibly to see a member of their own; but it is surprising to note how much of their attention is given to others. You can see them sitting along the streets on some old familiar store-box dangling their legs, whittling, and jabbering on all kinds of topics for hours together, but always with an eye to business; that is, of making a church-member, no matter how and from where he may come. They are wonderfully fond of visiting—and your people no less than their own. Though they know the bother and risk of it, they even like to lend books to, and exchange papers with, all sorts of men and women. It is to be hoped that they do not belong there, but they do remind us of the class of men spoken of by St. Paul to Timothy I. c. 4 and II. c. 3.

Luther, we find, gave no quarters to such cringing and crouching fellows, but denounced their underhand practices in the severest terms. In a letter written in 1531, *On Sneaks and Hedge-priests*, (*Won den Schleichern und Winkelpredigern*), and which was addressed against the inroads made into the churches of his faith by the anabaptists, he says, among other things, the following:

"In the first place they are best met by demanding of them to show their vocation, to say who has commanded them to come or to creep in among us and preach in secret: they will not be able to make answer or to present any credentials. And I say of a truth that if such sneaks had not the least fault otherwise and were thorough saints, this one thing" (that they come to us without command and call) "is

sufficient to convict them of being messengers and teachers of the devil. For the Holy Ghost does not creep about, but openly flies down from heaven. The serpent crawls, but the dove flies; therefore is such crawling the devil's way, and no mistake of that.

"I have heard it said how these insidious fellows approach the harwesters in the field and preach to them between work-hours; so also to the colliers and woodmen at their work; and thus they everywhere sow their seed and sound about their poisonous doctrines, and thereby draw away the people from their own pastor and church. Now there you may notice the devil's real step and art: how he avoids the light, and mouses in the dark. Who is so dull as not to perceive that they are the devil's messengers? If they were of God and upright, they would first of all go to the pastor of the place, confer with him, make known their calling, relate what they believe, and inquire whether he would allow them publicly to preach it. If the pastor did not permit them, they would be excused before God, and they might then shake the dust off their feet, etc. For the pulpit, the font and the altar are placed into the pastor's charge as is also the entire pastoral care. But they desire secretly to supplant the pastor with all his authority such are really thieves and murderers of souls, blasphemers, and enemies of Christ and His Church."

Further on Luther shows how to deal with a church-member who receives and aids such men. "Ask him," he says, "Who has bidden you to harbor this sneak and to hearken to his secret preaching? Whence do you know that he has the command to instruct you, and that you are to learn from him? Why have you not given notice of this to your pastor? Why do you leave the church where you were baptized, instructed, corrected, and where you belong in God's own order? Why do you crouch about in the dark? Why do you introduce things new and strange, and that secretly too and without command? Who gave you authority to divide this church and cause schism among us? What right have you to despise, to judge and condemn your pastor, behind his back and before he has been heard or indicted? How have you become such a judge of your pastor, yes, and of your own self?" (Erl. Ed. 31, p. 214.)

The reader will observe that every question put to the person misled by the allotrioepiscopos, may be readily turned into a cogent argument against the offender, and so be used to expose his unlawful and ruinous ways.

Doctrinal indifference, liberalism, syncretism and unionism are characteristic of modern churchdom; but notwithstanding this, the war of extermination waged by one church against another is perhaps as active as ever it was. True, there may not be that outspoken animosity and that openness of attack which have marked the conflict in days gone by; but the antagonism is still there, and the unhappy rivalry leads to excesses and wrong-doings as much now as ever it did, though they be not as strikingly manifest. In these as in other things, men have learned to cast a certain gloss of refinement on their ugly doings. That liberalism and unionism have, in reality, done little or nothing to abate proselytism, as might have been expected, reflects very unfavorably upon the propagandists of the present. Their object can hardly be to make converts to their faith; for, as unionists, distinctive doctrines count for very little in their estimation. What then, if they are honest in their unionistic professions, do they mean by meddling with others not of their conviction, and to what end do they invade the churchly domains of others, be it secretly or openly? There can be but one answer: they either desire to make converts, and then they are hypocrites; or they wish merely to increase their own members and this without regard to the particular quality of the accession. In either case, the meddler, as he now is, does a most sorrowful business. Mr. C. of the x. persuasion and Mr. B. of the y. persuasion as "dear brethren" recruit their forces and fight side by side, and the battle done, they—fight each other for the spoils!

No, unionism can never put an end to proselytism,—one devil is not cast out by another; all that the one evil will do for the other is to make it more corrupt as to motive, sordidly selfish in purpose, and more unscrupulous as to the methods employed. What alone, if anything, can put an end to this disgraceful business of meddling and wrangling, of stealing church-members and murdering souls, is the holy exclusiveness of divine truth coupled with the right and order it

establishes, and with the spirit of moderation which is begotten of it. The true Christian pastor and people are zealous of the truth to the exclusion of all error and of every admixture of things foreign to it. They indeed wish to make converts to this truth, but by the strength of this same truth only. They will endeavor to spread this truth, but only within such limits and by such means and methods as their Lord has prescribed. They will not go to places and people whither they are neither sent nor called. Dearly as they love the truth, faithfully as they cling to it for themselves and much as they delight in its conquests among others, yet will they acknowledge and respect the rights of all Christian churches, though they be not wholly sound in doctrine. Because, and in so far as, any Church is a Christian Church it is a plant of God. Hence it has the keys and the right to their undisturbed use. It has the ministry of the Word together with all the duties, privileges and responsibilities accompanying it. And from its abuse it does not follow that they have forfeited it, much less that anybody may possess himself of it. A man who takes another's property because he misapplies it, is a thief for all that. Luther, as has been well said in connection with the point in question, was called to the ministry by the Romish Church; but we have never heard that he himself or any one else has ever doubted the validity of his ordination and of his call to the work of the ministry.

Our fourth proposition brings the principles contended for to bear on synods. They do apply here; for although synods are really only human institutions, inasmuch as they are not prescribed by God, that does not say that they are without all power and authority and rights such as should be respected, even as before God. We are sure that they have the divine sanction. In view of the foundation on which Christian synods are based, of the things they aim to accomplish, of the spirit which animates them, of the work which they do, and of the blessings which God bestows on them, it is certain that they are something precious in the sight of the Lord. Enough to show, generally, that also before God they may be sinned against, and that they themselves may sin the one against the other;—yes, and that 1 Pet. 4, 15 may contain a lesson also intended for them.

If the relation existing between the individual and a congregation be in some respects more sacred than is the relation of that congregation to the synod of its connection, yet will no one deny the strong analogy of these two relations. Both are churchly in their character, and relations of religious liberty and possessing churchly as well as civil rights. Now since it is forbidden us to meddle with the relation of a Christian to his congregation, it can hardly be right to meddle with the relation of the congregation to its synod. And it is not. If it is wrong to steal a single church-member, it can not be right to steal a whole parish. To reason contrariwise, one might as well say that, while petit larceny is theft and punishable, grand larceny is justifiable and permissible.

It is very sad that synods, let us say of our own Lutheran faith and church in this land, do not more faithfully respect their mutual rights than at times is done; or that they do not insist that the synodical rights of others be respected by their constituents—be these district-synods, their presidents, missionaries or pastors. It seems to us a dreadful sin when synods half-way meet, welcome with open arms, and give home and succor to such congregations or factions of congregations whose only grievance is that Lutheranism where they are is too Lutheran for them. As long as this evil continues among us, wholesome discipline will be much retarded if not rendered next to impossible. Take, for example, a unionistic people, or a congregation abetting secret societyists, insisting on pulpit and altar fellowship with sectarians, etc.: what shall we, who are convinced of the error of their ways, do? Shall we tell them to go and connect with such "Lutheran" synods as would let men think and do as they please in these things? If we did, we were faithless stewards indeed, and pastors without consciences. But again, what shall we do? Patiently instruct the willing and discipline the refractory? Even so; and so we try to do. But oh the discouragements, the shame and mortification that come over us in such our endeavors, when we notice that other church-bodies bearing our own name stand by and look on with the hope that we will not succeed, and that they give plain intimations to the troubled charge that among them it could have its own way.

and be at peace. Yes, have its own way, whether right or wrong; for, in their estimation, such "small things" are not worth quarrelling about. Now when this is done by parties belonging to synods which profess to be one with us in the faith, and say that they desire to be one with us in practice, such a procedure is hard to understand; and the iniquity of it seems to us to be all the greater in the light of such professions. When the sectarian errorist meddles with us, he wants to make converts to his particular tenets; when the sectarian unionist meddles with us, he may after all have the same end in view; but what can the Lutheran want who meddles with Lutherans, and what are his motives?—Luther calls the allotroepiscopos who comes in among our churches from without, a thief and a murderer. Accordingly, when Lutherans so come and prey upon Lutherans, they must be fraticides. From these, may the good Lord deliver us!

It seems to be with reference especially to John 10, v. 1 and 10, that Luther speaks of these busy-bodies as thieves and murderers; (comp. W. Vol. 12, p. 385 sq.,) and the presumption is, not only that they are persons who take to themselves the office without a call, but that they are teachers of false doctrines beside. And this, not without good reason. Like false prophets, they generally come to people in sheep's clothing; and therefore the inference is both natural and justifiable that they are ravening wolves, that is, thieves and murderers of souls.

That they disregard the law and order of God and men; that they go whither they are not sent, and come when nobody calls them; that they do what they have no command to do, and in many ways encroach on and interfere with the most holy mission of others—all this is bad enough. But when to this it must be added that they teach doctrines contrary to the Word of God, and that their influence throughout is ruinous to the souls of men—as is most always the case—then is the measure of their iniquity made full; and then can we readily understand why they have been denounced as thieves and murderers. They unsettle the faith of men, give rise to vain disputes, engender doubts, are an occasion for stumbling to weak brethren and an offense to all; they lead to indifference in the truth and not seldom to infidelity; they

create schism and hinder true union among Christians; in a thousand ways they disturb the peace of Israel and do they work ruin to the cause of God.

"Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called." 1 Cor. 7, 20.

C. H. L. S.

SOME MISTAKES OF SCIENTISTS.

In writing to the Colossians St. Paul gives the following warning in regard to the claims of science falsely so called: "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ." It is in accordance with these words that we herewith undertake to expose some of the mistakes and false assumptions of scientists, ancient and modern, in order that we may all the better "beware lest they spoil" us and those over whom the Holy Ghost has made us overseers. It is, however, not our intention to endeavor to refute all unwarranted claims of men of science the world over; for we have neither the ability nor the time requisite for such a task. Nor is there any need that this should be done. It is enough to show that many and great errors have been committed by scientists and received as undoubted truth by the world, in order that those who still have ears to hear may hear and beware lest they be spoiled and poisoned with the notion, that when so called science speaks all else, God's Word not excepted, must keep silence.

The arrogance of many scientists passes understanding. They have drunk of the cup of philosophy and vain deceit until they have become thoroughly intoxicated and imagine themselves possessed of all wisdom and knowledge, whilst in fact they know but little and have not even the rudiments of that true wisdom whose beginning is the fear of the Lord. They think they are explaining everything while they are explaining nothing; suppose themselves to be a colossus of learning while they are a colossus of self-conceit; and claim to be putting an end to ignorance and superstition, while many of their claims and theories are the very embodiment of

ignorance and superstition of the very worst kind. Professing themselves to be wise, they have become fools. Let not the reader suppose that our language is too severe. We refer to those scientists who set up their science against the teachings of the Word of the Lord, and many of whom are out and out atheists. Whoever says there is no God or claims to know better than God Himself what the facts and laws of nature are, is a fool, no matter how earnestly he may profess to be wise. "The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God."

The hold which modern science has upon the people is simply marvelous. They seem to be perfectly captivated by it. Whatever it proclaims they receive and believe as indisputable and beyond all question. Any one who ventures to challenge its claims they look upon as a "crank," whilst the scientists are regarded as heroes and benefactors of the human race.

Nor are the common people the only ones that are thus captivated by the false claims of science. Even ministers of the church are held by the same charm as in a vise. Some of them go so far as to preach Darwinism from their pulpits, or to teach it from their professional chairs, as the ecclesiastical trials, which so frequently occur, abundantly testify. It is not uninteresting to inquire why so many learned men, ministers of the church included, so readily accept the conclusions of scientists. No doubt the reason is to be found in the following circumstances. Scientists, as a rule, are specialists, devoting their attention almost exclusively to one particular branch of investigation; and therefore it is taken for granted that they know because they *ought* to know, from the amount of study and experiment they have applied to any subject, what the facts in connection with it are, and that it is unnecessary, if not presumptuous, for those who are not specialists to investigate for themselves. Moreover not all have the time to make an investigation of the truth or falsity of the claims of science, even if they had the desire to do so. Some are not able to examine for themselves, either because they are not furnished with the necessary intellectual outfit, or because they have not the requisite books and instruments, nor the means of obtaining them, nor access to those of others. Furthermore, some have neither the inclination nor the

patience to investigate for themselves, even if they had the time, ability and means to do so ; for either such investigation is distasteful to them in itself, or they do not wish to bring down upon themselves the ridicule of the thoughtless multitude, in case they would find things to be entirely different from what they are represented by scientists. But perhaps the chief reason why men of science have things pretty much their own way, and are able to disseminate their doctrines and theories without encountering much opposition, is the wide-spread indifference to the truths of Holy Scripture, and the manifest lack of that faith in God and divine things which alone can preserve men from error and enable them to distinguish between the right and the wrong, the true and the false.

Between true science and the Bible there is no conflict. Nature and Revelation are two books by the same Author. Though they differ in their scope and character, they are not antagonistic. He who reads both books correctly will find them to be in harmony with each other in all their parts ; for God cannot contradict Himself. But between science falsely so called and the Bible there is a conflict, and a very serious and severe conflict at that. This is admitted by the scientists themselves ; yea, they boast of the fact in a most supercilious manner, and claim that their investigations prove the Bible to be all a myth. Sad as this is, it is yet praiseworthy in comparison with the disgraceful and contemptible attempts of many ministers to prove that there is no conflict between the assumptions of false science and the Scriptures, by taking those assumptions to be true and doing violence to both the letter and the spirit of the Bible, to make it harmonize with the statements of scientists. By such men science is made a Procrustus' bed to fit which the Bible must be lengthened or shortened, and changed and distorted, until its very life is destroyed. Shame on the men who claim to be ministers of the Gospel and treat the Word of the Master in such an abominable manner.

We desire it to be thoroughly understood, once for all, that we have great respect for true science, and advocate the study of it most heartily. If only the science taught is genuine we cannot have too much of it. But if it be fasle

we cannot have too little of it; the less we then have of it the better. Our warfare is with false science. It is not because we love war that we engage in it, but because we love the truth, and because false science is dangerous every way. If we do not resist the onslaughts of this enemy of the truth God will not hold us guiltless on the day of judgment. However much we may detest war and love peace, we must still grapple with the false thrones and false assumptions of scientists, if we would do our duty by ourselves and our fellow-men. The case is one in which the peace we desire must be fought for, if we would obtain it. We therefore have no alternative. If we would be faithful to the truth entrusted to our care we must contend against all that is false, no matter where found or by whomsoever set forth and upheld.

GEOLOGY AND THE BIBLE.

None of the sciences is more arrogant in its assumptions than Geology, albeit it has in reality less to boast of than any of the others. In this, however, it follows the law of its nature: being a species of quackery, it must do an immense amount of extravagant advertising in order to get and retain the ear of the public. It is but a child when compared with such sciences as Astronomy, Geometry, and Psychology; but like many other children it has been petted and indulged until it has become utterly spoiled. It presents in itself an illustration of Aesop's frog that tried to swell itself to the dimensions of an ox.

Hence it need not surprise us to find Geology claiming that the world is much older than the Bible represents it to be. According to Geologists it required millions of years for the earth to become a suitable abode for man. Those of them who still desire to be regarded as Christians try to make the Bible harmonize with their theory by explaining the six days of creation as representing six indefinitely long periods of time. It is impossible for them, however, to tell us exactly how long each period lasted. True, they do a good deal of guessing in regard to the matter; but no two of them exactly agree in their conjectures. This fact of itself should be sufficient to refute their theory. The Bible speaks of each day as having an evening and a morning, and therefore an ordi-

nary day of 24 hours' duration is meant. The account of Moses is in no sense guesswork, but a plain, positive and definite statement of the facts involved. Why then do the Geologists not accept his account as correct? Simply because they claim that it is impossible for the earth to have been formed in so short a time. This claim, however, rests ultimately upon the belief that the earth, in one way or another, formed itself. For if we grant that the first verse of Genesis is true, there can be no question about the possibility of the six days of creation being composed of 24 hours each. If we admit that God created the heavens and the earth, we must admit that He could create it as easily in six ordinary days as in six hundred millions of years. To deny this would be absurd. God is omnipotent; and whatever He desires to do He can do in a moment just as well as in a long period of time. Hence those who say that it is impossible for the earth to have been formed in six common days, must at heart deny that God in reality created it. This is also admitted by many Geologists. Admitting this, they are bold enough to affirm that they have no need of God in their theories. But when we come to examine their much lauded theories, we find that they really explain nothing, so far as they conflict with the Bible, and are as full of inconsistencies as an egg is full of itself. Thus Lyell at first calculated that it required 100,000 years for the formation of the Mississippi Delta, but afterwards reduced the period to 50,000 years! What dependence can be placed upon such calculations. No wonder that Mark Twain some years ago indulged in some pleasantries in regard to the shortening of the Mississippi, stating that, according to this shortening process, the time must have been when the Mississippi was much longer and extended out over the Gulf of Mexico like a fishing rod, and that the time will come when the cities along the great stream, though now hundreds of miles apart, will be drawn together and have but one Mayor and one Board of Aldermen.

Lyell calculated that 30,000 years were necessary to wash out the channel of the Niagara. Other Geologists claim that 10,000 years were sufficient. This is a specimen of the kind of agreement that exists among the devotees of Geology which they are in the habit of calling an *exact* science.

The credulity of Geologists is truly wonderful. The famous Cardiff Giant is a case in point. A shrewd Yankee, with an eye to business, and knowing the nature of his customers, had a huge image of a man manufactured in Chicago, and secretly conveyed to the State of New York and buried in a swamp. In due time the Giant was exhumed and taken from place to place for the benefit of the curious, but still more for the benefit of the proprietor's pocket-book. The Geologists declared the Giant an Antediluvian that had flourished on the glacier fields of the Tertiary period. The Rev. P. Eirich, from whose book on the *Hexaemeron und die Geologie* this account is taken, states that the Giant's "arrival at Albany was welcomed with great festivities. The Geologic Grand Sultans decided with the exact knowledge of experts that he had lived at the time of the gigantic megatheria and mammoths, and looked down upon us from that hoary period of the past in the spirit of Darwinian development. It was only in a historical way that the deception was discovered, when the stocks suddenly fell to zero."

Notwithstanding all that the Geologists say in regard to the time required to bring about the changes which they claim have taken place in our earth, we are perfectly safe in holding fast to the Bible account of the creation, although only about six thousand years have elapsed since "the beginning" mentioned in Genesis. As the Bible furnishes us with the only plausible history of the creation of heaven and earth, the burden of proof rests wholly upon those who deny its statements or endeavor to explain them away. He who denies the historical account of the defeat of Napoleon at Waterloo, must furnish the proof, or his denial will amount to nothing. This is true of all history: he who denies must furnish the evidence on which his denial rests, inasmuch as the history, if it is at all worthy of the name, always gives the evidence on which its affirmations are based. Hence we accept the statements of history until it is shown on good testimony that they are erroneous. Hence we must accept the Bible account of the creation, even if we place it on the level of profane history, until those who deny it are able to show that it is false. As Christians, however, we cannot place it on such a low level. To us it is the record which the Al-

mighty Himself has given, and we cannot admit for a moment that it can in any way be untrue. He has so plainly affixed His signature to it and stamped His seal upon it, that its genuineness and trustworthiness are beyond all question.

Moreover it cannot be shown that the facts of nature militate against the account of the creation as given in the Bible. Theories, not facts, are opposed to God's Word. In spite of all that has been done in the way of palaeontological research and discoveries, nothing has ever been found that weighs as much as a feather against the record contained in Genesis or in any other book of the Bible. What Geologists say in regard to the great age of certain fossils is sheer conjecture, has never been proved and never can be proved. It certainly requires no argument to show that conjecture and proof are by no means identical. It is in the former, not in the latter, that the achievements of scientists, as against the Bible, chiefly consist.

So far as human knowledge goes, the coal formations and various stratified rocks, as well as the ocean, lake and river beds, now existing, may, for the most part, have been created at the beginning in the same form in which they appear at present. It is quite probable, moreover, that the Noachian Flood brought about great changes upon the surface of the earth. At any rate, taking into consideration the fact that God created the earth, in a miraculous manner, out of nothing, and afterwards caused all living beings, save those preserved in the Ark, to be destroyed, there is not the slightest ground for resorting to conjectures and hypotheses that carry us back beyond the time mentioned in the Bible as the date of the creation, in order to account for the existence of things as we find them. The data furnished by Moses, writing by inspiration of the Most High, are every way sufficient; and it is the utmost folly and presumption for scientists to endeavor to improve upon his record in any way whatsoever.

We deem it scarcely necessary to enter upon an argument in favor of a literal interpretation of the six days of creation. It is difficult to see how any one would think of any other interpretation, if he approached the sacred record without prejudice. It is only after men have had their judgment warped by the notions taught by Geologists and kindred

scientists, that they seek to explain away the literal meaning conveyed by the words used by Moses. Suffice it to say that to depart from the explanation that an ordinary day is meant when it is said that the evening and the morning were the first day—the same statement being made in connection with the remaining days of creation—is to involve the interpreter in hopeless and inextricable difficulties; for the day must inevitably have consisted of an evening and a morning, or a night and a day, no matter what explanation we may employ in regard to its length. Hence if the "day" consisted of a long period, say 10,000 years, the nocturnal part of it must have been about half as long—a night of 5,000 years' duration! The longer the period of the "day," the worse for the night. But even if the period is taken to have been comparatively short, consisting, say of 2,000 years only, the night part of it would still possess the respectable length of 1,000 years! Now what would have become of the vegetation created on the third "day," and of the fowl created on the fifth "day," during such a night of a thousand years? Surely whoever is willing to accept the interpretation put upon the Scriptures by Geologists, together with all that such an interpretation involves, must also be ready to close his eyes and open his mouth to receive anything that any charlatan of science may ask him to swallow.

It certainly must be taken for granted that God gave us a record of the creation for the purpose of giving us an insight into the origin of the universe, but more especially of the existence of the earth and of the things that are therein. Now the very fact that six days are distinctly mentioned is proof sufficient that He desired us to know just how long the creative period lasted and what was done on each individual day, so that we might not trouble ourselves with useless and hopeless speculations in regard to matters far beyond the reach of human investigation, but still necessary to be known • in view of the existence of sin and the salvation of the human race through the mediatorial work of His only begotten Son. But if we follow the lead of Geologists, we might just as well be without the account of the creation altogether. For what else is it but useless and hopeless speculations that we are plunged into by such a course? In the case supposed

we would be no better off than the old heathen philosophers, who busied themselves incessantly with conjectures and theories respecting the being of God and the origin of the universe, and yet at the close of all their efforts were no nearer the truth than when they commenced. In fact we would be much worse off than they; for we have the light of God's Word of which they had no knowledge, and our responsibility is much greater than theirs, seeing that we enjoy so many advantages of which they were entirely deprived. "Of him to whom much is given, much will be required," is the principle by which we must judge ourselves and shall at last be judged at the bar of God.

Seeing, then, that God wants us to understand how and in what length of time the world was created, if He had meant a period of years when He used the word "day," He certainly would somewhere have told us so in the Bible, and not have waited for the scientists of the nineteenth century to give us the important information. But He nowhere even intimates that He desires the word "day" to be understood in any other than a literal sense. Whatever reference He makes to it in other parts of the Scriptures is of a nature to give additional weight to the necessity of a literal interpretation of it. The whole sabbatic law is a strong proof of what we here claim. "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in *six days* the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it," Ex. 20. Now it is certain that the Sabbath, thus constituted, consisted of 24 hours. No one will dispute this who knows anything whatever about the meaning of the Bible. This being the case, must it not be plain to every unprejudiced mind that the six days of creation consisted of six times 24 hours, seeing that the Lord told the Jews that they should labor *six days*, because He had created heaven and earth in the same length of time? The word "for" in the above quoted passage is a causal particle,

introducing the reason why the Sabbath was instituted, and should convince every fair-minded man that the word "days" is to be understood in the ordinary sense, and ought not to be made to do all manner of service, no matter how foreign to both the letter and the Spirit of Holy Writ, in the interest of self-important scientists. In view of the attempts of certain theologians to harmonize the dicta of science and of the Bible by shaping the latter to suit the former, the words of Huxley are worthy of being quoted: "If we are to listen to these exegetes, we must conclude that what are so clearly set forth in the first chapter of Genesis as creative days—as if, with painful exactness, the possibility of a misunderstanding had to be avoided—were not days, but periods, whose length is suited to every convenience. We are also taught that it is not contrary to that phraseology to believe that plants and animals originated from rudiments similar to themselves by means of natural processes continuing for millions of years. Whoever does not understand Hebrew can do nothing but remain neutral in this matter, and admire the wonderful flexibility of a language that admits of such diverse explanations."

If, then, we do not wish to stultify ourselves and to become the laughing-stock of the scientists who reject the Bible altogether, we must be consistent with our position as the professed children of God and continue to believe, teach and confess, as our fathers did, that His Word is inspired, and that before it all science must fall prostrate or be rejected; for heaven and earth shall pass away, but that Word shall not pass away: it abideth forever.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER .IN MODERN THEOLOGY.

*Reviewed and criticized by Dr. F. A. Philippi; tr. from the
Kirchliche Glaubenslehre of the author by G. H. S.*

In passing over now to the more modern development, we learn that the rationalistic school remained on the basis of Zwingli's doctrine of the Lord's Supper, this being homo-

geneous to it. He too maintained the symbolical interpretation of the words of institution, claimed that the body of the Lord is not present in the earthly elements, and considered the Lord's Supper merely as a memorial, confessional and love-feast of Christians. He thus also substituted the subjective offering for the objective sacrament. The difference between rationalism and Zwinglianism is not to be found in the doctrine of the sacrament itself, but in the different soteriology and soteriology. Rationalism, by denying the atónements made by Christ's death and the appropriation of it through faith and which in general looks upon Christianity merely as an institution for religious moral improvement, could not regard the Lord's Supper as an act confessional of evangelical justifying faith, but had to consider it as serviceable merely for the achievement of moral purposes. According to *Wegscheider* (Institut. § 179 f.), the breaking of the bread and the pouring out of the wine is the symbol of Christ's death, to which He submitted for the benefit of His friends, but especially for the confirmation of His saving doctrine and in commendation of a life acceptable to God. The celebration of the Lord's Supper consecrates and unites the participants for a confession of the Christian religion, through which a new way to the forgiveness of sin is opened; it, so to say, presents to them the moral presence of Christ by obliging them to receive the doctrine confirmed by His example and His death; and it portrays the equal fate of all mortals before God, the highest Source and Protector of the moral law, and also the bond of that reciprocal love through which especially the worshipers of Christ are bound together. From this it follows that in our times also this rite can be observed by all Christians with manifold benefits to themselves; or even that it must be thus observed, if the participants approach only with well prepared minds; and if this rite is only arranged wisely and in accordance with the minds of cultured people, *in usum moralem optime converti potest*. *Bretschneider* (Handbuch der Dogmatik, vol. II, § 200 p. 672) thinks, that indeed, from 1 Cor. cc. 10 and 11 it can be seen that the Lord's Supper had been regarded as a solemn memorial of the death of Jesus and of its beneficial effects for the saving of men; as a public confession of Christianity or of

faith in Jesus as the Redeemer; as a means to awaken and to strengthen fidelity and steadfastness in this confession as also obedience to the commands of Jesus and the confidence in His promises in reference to our future after death; and also as a feast of intimate brotherly love. In this way the early church had considered it, and in this way we too should consider it. But on p. 675 he says: "For he too who does not honor Jesus as the Atoner, but only as the teacher of divine truths and as the benefactor of mankind who gave up His life for the noblest of objects; such an one will nevertheless, through the commemoration of the death of Jesus, be awoken to an equal zeal for truth and virtue, to (moral) improvement and to steadfastness in the contest with superstition and evil, and be filled with the presentiment of a better world. Thus in him too, although in a different way, the ultimate purpose of Christianity is promoted, namely the deliverance from sin and the ennobling of man for a better world; and in this manner the Lord's Supper is for him also a beneficent sacrament." In his judgment of the Church's doctrine of the real presence of the body and the blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper, he, in § 202, p. 685, starts out with the following principle put in the words of the supernaturalist Reinhard, that "the moral benefit of the Lord's Supper for our improvement and consolation (*Beruhigung*) depends neither on a *fixed system concerning the meaning of the words of institution*, nor on a clear insight into the way and manner in which it all takes place." Just as Armenianism is ever ready to go over to Socinianism, thus supernaturalism is ready to go over to rationalism. The positive dogma is indifferentiated and the religious moral ennobling of man is declared to be the final aim of Christianity. In § 203, p. 709, Bretschneider expressly declares over against Luther, that the Lord's Supper is not effectual individually in order to produce forgiveness of sin for the participants, since the believing communicant has already received forgiveness of sin before he partakes of communion. Compare also the rationalistic work of David Schulz. *Die christl. Lehre vom Heil. Abendmahl nach den Grundsätzen des N. T.*, Leipzig, 1824, 1831, written against Scheibel. *Das Abendmahl des Herrn*, Breslau 1823.

The mediating theology of our own day accepts on the

subject of the Lord's Supper, as it also does with regard to baptism, essentially the reformed conception. With the older supernaturalism and rationalism it denies the literal interpretation of the words of institution, the real sacramental union of the heavenly and the earthly elements and with this the partaking with the mouth of the body and the blood of the Lord, on the part of both believers and unbelievers, and is thus opposed to the whole distinctively Lutheran doctrine on the substance of the Lord's Supper. In regard to its standpoint it can be stated, that it is closely connected with the doctrine of the plan of salvation, according to which the so-called living communion (*Lebensgemeinschaft*) with Christ is emphasized in a one-sided manner, or rather is made the sole matter of importance. Since only the believers can become partakers of this communion, and since faith is the necessary subjective means for this, as a result in this case too, as in that of the Reformed doctrine, the acceptance of a metaphorical interpretation of the words of institution virtually the substance and the effect of the sacrament are made to coalesce as being one and the same thing. The Lord's Supper is conceived either in a more Zwinglian manner as a mere means of representation, or at the same time more in the manner of Calvin, as a means of sealing and thus as a means of preserving and of furthering the living communion with Christ.

As the leading representative of this form of doctrine we again find Schleiermacher, *Der Christ. Glaube*. Vol. II, §§ 139-142. The living communion with Christ and with the believers, with which salvation has begun and into which we have gained an entrance through baptism, stands in need of assistance from time to time over against the hindering influences of the world. The assistance needed we seek for in the Sacrament of the Altar. This double communion, namely with Christ and with the believers, is promoted by the public worship, but in the most harmonious and complete manner through the highest feature of this worship, namely the Lord's Supper, which has for this reason been established also by Christ as a rite to be celebrated in common. In the Lord's Supper all the effects result immediately and wholly without any special cooperation of any individual, from the words of institution, in which the redemp-

tive and unifying love of Christ does not only present itself, but ever exerts itself anew with power, and in trusting obedience to these words the rite itself is always observed. The communication of the body and the blood of Christ is identical with the communication of His life to His own, with His self-sacrifice for the strengthening of their spiritual life, with the nourishing of their life out of the fullness of His own. The spiritual partaking of Christ and of His body and blood in the Lord's Supper cannot be essentially different from that which takes place outside of the Supper. The distinguishing feature consists only in the fact that the results are made conditional upon the outward action, which Christ has put into close connection with these results. In reference to the connection between the bread and the body, and between the wine and the blood of Christ, only the Roman Catholic and the Sacramentarian views, i. e. those of the Anabaptists, Mystics, Schwenkfeldians, Quakers, Socinians, are to be excluded. Whatever lies within these limits is not to be rejected as unorthodox. There are three views which we must allow to stand side by side, namely the Lutheran, Zwinglian and the Calvinistic. All three have their strong and their weak features; they are incomplete attempts which still require continued and unbiased investigations on the part of the exegetes. Until these have been completed, a common Church doctrine can be set up only with regard to the effects of the Lord's Supper. The right understanding of the words of institution is necessary only in so far as the expected effect, namely the strengthening of the spiritual life, depends on it; and every interpretation which does not violate the rules of hermeneutics can be for us the right one, if only it does not endanger to the believer the connection between the rite and its effect. But this is done by none of these three views which have gained an entrance into the Evangelical Church, by which fact the idea which underlies the union of these churches in Prussia, namely that these differences can not hinder the partaking of the Supper in common, is confirmed. Since the sole benefit of the partaking of this sacrament is the strengthening of our communion with Christ, there is included in this also the strengthening of the Christians in their union with each other, since this union de-

pends so entirely upon their connection with Christ, that a union of the individual with Christ can not be thought without his union also with the believers, which latter idea is not brought out so prominently in the Symbols as it should be. When the Symbols emphasize it, that in the sacrament the forgiveness of our sins is renewed and confirmed; and then that we experience an increase of our powers in the work of sanctification, these two can not in the actual state of affairs be separated from each other. For as regeneration becomes truly fixed and is made certain only through the state of sanctification, thus too, when the communion with Christ has been disturbed by sin, the certainty that the sin is forgiven, can be made really sure only in the consciousness of a re-established and strengthened life. And for this purpose the presence of the whole congregation of believers during the celebration of the Lord's Supper is an important matter. According to this view then, everything depends upon our fellowship with Christ, which indeed existed already before for the believer, but receives through the sacrament renewed strength and growth, so that Schleiermacher speaks even of a new influx of spiritual life-power out of the fullness of Christ for the removal of the consequences of universal sinfulness which stand in the way of the new life. Since, according to Schleiermacher's Christological fundamental premises, the new life is produced only through the subjective presence of the image of Christ and of His power living in the congregation, it is to be presumed that this life can be retained and increased only in the same manner in which it originally came into existence. But now in fact Schleiermacher speaks of a subjective realization (*vergegenwärtigung*) of Christ as well as of the congregation at the celebration of the Lord's Supper. But according to this view it would be reduced to a free (subjective) act of the congregation, in which through a self-produced common revival of the image of Christ, a new and increased growth of the power of Christ dwelling in the congregation would take place. The partaking of the earthly elements could then only yet be considered as a symbol chosen arbitrarily but nevertheless impressive. But in this manner the holy sacrament would entirely lose its character as an immediate sacramental divine

institution. In order not to lose this entirely, Schleiermacher, as we have seen, appeals to the words of institution by Christ, which have made the beneficial results depend upon the outward rite when this is carried out in confiding obedience to the words of institution. But such an inroad into the territory of what is historically positive (historische Positivität) in an objective and divine institution, must, by Schleiermacher's own principles, according to which dogmatics have to deal only with subjectively religious and Christian conditions of the soul, be called a *μετάβασις εἰς ἄλλο γένος*. This return to the words of institution is all the more unjustifiable, since he claims that the correct understanding of these words is to the present day a yet unsolved exegetical problem, so that that which is really offered to us in the Lord's Supper is to be drawn not from the words of institution but from some other source. With this however the opinion expressed above that the three interpretations of these words are of equal validity and yet incomplete, results directly in favor of the Lutheran conception. For although the view of Zwingli is called the clearest and most easily comprehended, yet according to Schleiermacher it still leaves unexplained why Christ, if nothing else is contained in the words of institution than Zwingli finds in them, made use of these peculiar expressions. And the opinion of Calvin also he thought gives a new reason for wavering between the temptation lying in the symbolism of seeking for more in the sacrament than the explanation develops, and between the falling back upon something more external, since that which is really meant can not be discovered. Against the Lutheran conception he does not raise an exegetical objection but rather only a dogmatical doubt, namely that it approaches too near to the Romish type which favors superstitious notions; and that it is impossible to preach and make intelligible the fact and its nature and mode maintained by the Lutheran view. In other words the literal conception is in fact rejected only on account of the inability to conceive of the fact established by it. And just here the rationalistic motive of the spiritualistic doctrine of the sacrament becomes manifest. Schleiermacher, against his own fundamental dogmatical principles, appeals to the positive words of institu-

tion, in order to escape the undeniable consequences of his own premises, namely the utter rejection of the sacraments, in the manner of the Quakers; and yet he refuses to give that obedience to the word of the Lord which the Lord Himself demands, in order not to be compelled to sacrifice his substitution of *a priori* speculative mysticism for the revealed mystery.

In exactly the same spirit as Scheiermacher, *Nitzsch* conceives the dogmatic import of the Lord's Supper, only that by laying greater stress upon it as a pledge and seal, he formally again approaches Calvin's view. He says in his "System of Christian Doctrine," § 193: "As a pledge and seal that a member of the Church stands in a living communion with the Lord, and in order to grow therein, the Lord has instituted the Sacrament." 1 Cor. 11, 23, cf. 10, 16. For as He at one time, John 6, 51, declared that the partaking of His flesh and blood, or the participation in His personal life, which indeed can take place also in other ways than through the external celebration of the Sacrament, is to be the condition of participation in eternal life, and at the same time has indicated that only through the completion of His work through His atoning death He would become the real object of this participation and would become the perfect means of life, so has He also at another time instituted the mystic rite, which not only represents such a partaking and such a communion, but in figure also should be a pledge and medium for it, and this to continue, according to the explanation of the Apostle, 1 Cor. 11, 26, until He would come again, and in a peculiar manner is to make present to our minds the crucified and raised Lord. Accordingly all believers, in so far as they may, after self-examination according to 1 Cor. 11, 28, experience a purified desire, should come from time to time to partake together of the blessed bread and wine, while declaring with grateful hearts His death and thereby being renewed again with the heavenly life of their Head. In proof of this a passage is quoted from Luther's Larger Catechism, which treats only of the effect but not of the substance of the Lord's Supper, in order to prove that in this doctrine, which is conceived entirely in a Reformed sense, the essence and the effect of the sacrament are throughout confounded and indiscriminately thrown together.

In a similar manner, only with a stronger tendency toward Zwingli, Neander expresses himself. Cf. e. g. his *History of the Planting and Direction of the Christian Church by the Apostles*, 3rd edition, p. 678 sqq., 792 sqq. According to 1 Cor. 11, 24, the Apostle Paul, he says, considers the Lord's Supper as a memorial feast of the fact that Christ offered up His life for the salvation of mankind, and of all the blessings thereby bestowed upon mankind. At the same the believers, in celebrating this feast together, shall with thanksgiving declare what they have received through the sufferings of Christ, which celebration for the joint praise of the Lord shall be considered also as a pledge of continued communion with Him. The sacramental act can be rightly executed only in case there exists already a living communion with the Redeemer; the memorial celebration with reference to the redeeming passion of Christ is in this act the fundamental feature, the consciousness of communion with Him is something which only follows it, although necessarily: "This cup is the *καυή διακήρυξη* can mean only this: "The cup represents or presents to your senses the establishment of this new relation." In accordance with this the words *τοῦτό εστι* must be understood as meaning: "This represents my body." In a like manner when the bread is called the communion of the body of Christ, thereby nothing else is said than that it indicates, presents this communion, and is the means of appropriating this communion. Since thus the Lord's Supper represents the communion with Christ, thereby the reference to the communion of believers with one another as members of the one body of Christ which is founded thereon, is, of course, already implied. In this sense 1 Cor. 10, 17 is to be interpreted. When this passage tells us that we all partake of the one bread, and that this bread represents to us the body of Christ, it is thereby indicated that we are all related to one another as members of the one body of Christ. In a similar manner the symbol in John 6, namely the eating of Christ's flesh and the drinking of His blood, must be referred to the continued penetration of the whole nature of every one who, being received by faith into communion with Him, by means of the divine life principle, which through Him has been humanized and is to be so humanized in all who stand in communion with Him; and also to be referred

to the continued presentation of the divine, in the continual reception and absorption of which the whole process of a development of Christian life consists. The continuing regeneration of the human into the divine, this continuing adaptation of humanity to the body of Christ is represented in the Lord's Supper.

We see from this that Neander lays stress almost exclusively on the representative element, but that the pledge-element is almost entirely ignored and is heard of only incidentally, and then without having any real roots in the conception of the matter as a whole and without a sufficient foundation.

We shall adduce in proof of our thesis that the modern mediating theology is in principle entirely on the side of Zwingli and Calvin in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, only the statements of Lange, in his Positive Dogmatics, § 111. According to his view, the Lord's Supper is a *holy feast of thankoffering, a memorial feast, a feast of covenant* which the glorified Christ celebrates with those that are His and they with Him—a *covenantal feast* between brethren and a feast indicating membership in God's kingdom on the part of the adherents of Christ. He criticises the Roman Catholic view, because out of the signs and pledges of the body and the blood of Christ, it makes the substantial presence of His body and blood. He says that only a dynamical change of the bread and the wine into the body and blood of Christ, which change takes place in the participant himself, can be accepted, through which the inner life is increased not only spiritually, but is also nourished spiritually and bodily (*geistleiblich*), and the germ of the resurrection, the inner man, is quickened and brought to development. In this last feature, he thinks, lies the truth of the Lutheran view; only that this has in a one-sided manner denied the correct exegetical foundation of Zwingli's view and the correct dogmatalical superstructure of Calvin. The explanations of the words of institution given by the different reformers he conceives to be able to be united into one complete evangelical whole. The various reformers themselves did not quite succeed in their task. But the reformation effective in them has solved the problem. It will not be necessary to follow any further the

mystical-theosophical expositions of Lange, in all of which the opposition to the genuine Lutheran doctrine remain unchanged.

A middle way between the Reformed and the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper has of late been attempted by Kahn, cf. *Luth. Dogmatik*, vol. I. p. 616 ff.; vol. II. p. 485 sq. He is of the opinion that in the explanation of the words of institution he must depart from the exegesis of Lutheran theology, to which he had before adhered (*Lehre v. Abendmahl*, 1851). He thinks that the symbolical interpretation is the correct feature in Zwingli's view. The bread is to signify Christ's body; the breaking of the bread, the slaying of this body; the giving of the bread, the impartation of the body given into death for us; the eating of the bread, the appropriation in faith of the body slain. Accordingly the Lord's Supper, because it is the partaking of bread and wine as the symbols of the body and blood that were offered up, is primarily a feast of remembrance, in which the partaker confesses his faith in the sacrificial death of Christ. The feast ordained and given by God through Christ, has, however, as its contents the divine word concerning the sacrificial death, which Jesus Christ, who has instituted this Supper, gives to the partaker. Such a word of God, which is not only audible, but because it is clothed in earthly elements and, so to say, is embodied in these, is also visible, and which Christ gives to the individual in a manner perceived by the senses, is a *sacramental word*, which, like the whole Word of God throughout, is not void, but accomplishes that whereunto it is sent. Therefore bread and wine are not a mere symbol, but a *sign* which is at the same time also a *medium*. "Bread and wine, therefore, being the signs of the body and the blood of Christ, are, by virtue of the words of institution spoken by Christ, the sacramental word concerning the body and the blood of Christ, which in accordance with the command of Christ bestows the death of Christ." Whoever in faith partakes of the bread and wine as the sacrament of the body and the blood of Christ, receives the fruits of the death of Christ. i. e. forgiveness of sin. But with this the signification of the Lord's Supper is not exhausted. The Lord's Supper is not merely the appropriation of the atoning power of the death

of Christ. This atoning power continually abides in the corporeity of Christ which has passed through death. Whoever then in faith lays hold on the death of Christ, receives the atoning power of the blood of Christ which dwells in the glorified body of Christ. But he who receives this power of the glorified corporeity of Christ, "receives into himself this corporeity of Christ itself, and with this the whole living Christ." This is, according to Kahnis, the element of truth in the Lutheran interpretation of the words of institution. We can not in faith receive the body that was slain without receiving also the glorified body, because the power of the former lies in the latter. This reception indeed is not an eating and a drinking, but a spiritual taking through the medium of faith. The Lord's Supper is a spiritual eating and drinking. The medium for the body is the bread, not in this sense that this bread carries in itself the body of Christ, but that as a word it mediates the spirit, but by virtue of the spirit also the body of Christ.

It would seem that we have here merely a reproduction of Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and without doubt Calvin would not have refused to give his signature to the views of Kahnis. Although Kahnis himself is of the opinion that the doctrine of Calvin contains elements of truth, which the Lutheran theology has not yet sufficiently appreciated, yet he protests against having his doctrine identified with Calvin's; because the latter has not succeeded in getting beyond the Reformed separation of the sign from the substance, and because he contradicts himself by saying that God does not keep the promise which He has made, namely that of a communication of the body of Christ, the body itself not being given to the believer but only its powers. But this separation of sign and substance Kahnis himself has not overcome, for, according to his views also, the bread is not the immediate bearer of the body, and Calvin would at least not have admitted that only the powers of the body are given to the believers, but not the body itself. And in reality Calvin maintains a connection with the body which is in heaven through the medium of the spirit. Kahnis, accordingly, seems to differ from Calvin only in this, that he does not, with a separation of body and bread, maintain also a separa-

tion of the word and the spirit, and represents the body which is present through the medium of the spirit not as absent in heaven but as present spiritually on earth for the believers. But this would be a difference not in the doctrine itself of the Lord's Supper, but one that has its roots in the doctrine concerning the Word and the person of Christ. The Lord's Supper would continue, as is the case in the Reformed view, to be robbed of its specific contents. For as the audible word has the same effect as the visible word, faith effects in the case of the former in an equal manner the communion with the atoning power of the Lord's death, with the glorified body and the whole person of Christ, as faith does this in the case of the latter. The significance of the Lord's Supper can accordingly consist merely in this, that the outward and visible elements are added to the audible word as pledges and signs. But Kahn's doctrine of the Lord's Supper is open to other objections. The spiritual reception of the glorified body, according to him, is effected in this manner that the atoning power of Christ's death, which the faith in the words of the Lord's Supper grasps, is immanent in the glorified body of the Lord. This as it would seem theosophic sentence, which, we must confess we can not fully understand, is certainly not a scriptural sentence. For the Scriptures everywhere ascribe the power of atonement to the death itself of Christ, but never to His glorified body. And even Kahn himself says that through faith in the death of Christ, the atoning power and fruit of this death, or the forgiveness of sin, are appropriated. Thus then the bridge, which was to lead from the communion with the death of Christ to the communion with His glorified body, breaks into pieces under the feet of those who are to cross it. And besides it can scarcely be understood how the believing spirit should be a suitable and possible organ of reception for a bodily substance. As then it is not possible to reach the communion with the glorified body from the subjective side, the question arises whether this is possible from the objective side. But this likewise seems hardly possible. For the real presence of the body of the Lord in the holy Supper, even if only for spiritual partaking, nevertheless presupposes the ubiquity of this body, be it in the form of omnipresence or multivoli-

presence. But the Lutheran doctrine of ubiquity is expressly repudiated by Kahnis, vol. II, p. 600, on the well known pretext that this doctrine manifestly would lead to a doubling of the divine attributes. Finally Kahnis' view, that through the intervention of the spirit the body of Christ could enter into the unworthy also, in order to judge wherever it can not heal (vol. III, p. 504), falls to the ground according to his own premises. For if faith in the atoning death is alone the subjective medium for the reception of the glorified corporeity of Christ, then this can not be received *realiter* by those who do not believe. We can then speak only of a communication of this body to the unworthy in the sense of an objective offering and distribution, but not in the sense of a real subjective appropriation, hence only the Calvinistic sense. And thus we see how Kahnis' effort to mediate really ends on all sides in a return to Calvins doctrine of the Lord's Supper, with which it is in principle one. Nor can this be otherwise whenever the symbolical interpretation of the words of institution forms the basis and the starting point of the dogmatical development. When, however, Kahnis yields that the Lutheran synecdoche in itself is admissible, but finds this interpretation already rejected by the words of St. Luke and St. Paul, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood," which sentence, because a cup of wine could not possibly be the covenant's relation itself established through the death of Christ between God and man, can be interpreted only as meaning, This cup is the sign of the New Covenant in my blood, which then retrospectively would compel us to understand the words 'This is my body' in a metaphorical sense, it is indeed hard to understand how he can entirely ignore the impossibility of connecting the words "in my blood" with the words "the new covenant," in the sentence "This cup is the new covenant in my blood, which would of necessity demand the repetition of the article *ἡ* before the expression *ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἷματι*. This is maintained not only by Lutheran exegetes, but also by such men as Meyer. It is, on the other hand, a grammatical necessity to connect the expression "in my blood" with the words "this the cup" or with "is" and accordingly to interpret: "This cup is the new covenant through the blood which this cup contains," whereby the

Lutheran understanding of the words of institution is most decidedly confirmed, and the synecdoche, admitted as possible by Kahnis, becomes a necessity. Now just as the exegetical admission which Kahnis makes drives us back to the Lutheran exegesis of the words in the sacrament, so also do his dogmatical premises, in case they are at all consistently carried out. For if the word is the efficient bearer of the spirit, but the spirit the real bearer and medium of the glorified body of Christ, then the word as well as the spirit, namely both the visible and the audible word, or the visible element enclosed in the word, must itself be the immediate bearer of the body, from which then the *manducatio oralis* (eating with the mouth) follows naturally. Thus Kahnis' attempt at mediating shows that in truth there is no third thing between the Zwingli-Calvinistic and the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and that such an attempt, if consistently carried out, will result in a return to one or the other view.

The progressive Lutheranism of our day agrees indeed with the confessional Lutheran theology in defining the *substance* of the Lord's Supper, but departs from it in defining the *effects* of this Supper. When treating of the subject of baptism we already became acquainted with the tendency of this school to make a specific difference between the effect of the sacrament and the effect of the Word; and we there gave expression to our reasons for opposing it, for which reasons we can in general refer the reader to the discussion there. The *a priori* constructions of this party show their lack of scriptural foundation already in the fact that they do not harmonize among themselves. Only the one statement, which in its special applications would be capable of many modifications, could be designated as a view common to all; namely the statement, that the word exercises a *personal effect* (*Personwirkung*) but the sacrament an effect in nature (*Naturwirkung*). The same vacillation which we noticed in their closer characterization of word effect and sacramental effect, can be recognized again in the different conceptions with reference to the effect of baptism and of the Lord's Supper. It seems that a clear and thorough difference and a well ordered system of distinctive effects of the means of grace can be attained only then, when with reference to regeneration we

concede to the Word only a propaedeutic effect, but, on the other hand, to baptism as the vehicle of the Spirit of God, only the spiritual regeneration, and to the Lord's Supper, as the vehicle of the body of Christ, only the bodily regeneration. But if, on the contrary, this degradation of the Word and this separation of body and spirit do not find acceptance, they then ascribe to the Word the justification of the person, to the sacrament the regeneration of the spiritual bodily nature of man (*geist-leiblichen Naturgrundes*), whereby, however, person and nature, as also justification and regeneration, are violently torn asunder and the order of salvation is wounded to the quick. And in addition to this the difference at least between the effect of baptism and the effect of the Lord's Supper are in danger of collapsing, since both effects are represented to consist in an equal degree in the regeneration of the bodily and spiritual nature of man. It would perhaps then be still possible to define the difference that remained by the categories of creating and of preserving, or also of founding and of furthering and completing the bodily and spiritual regeneration. Only that in this case again it would not be possible to see why just the *spirit* of baptism and the *body* of the Lord's Supper should bring about these effects which are essentially one and the same. Hence the constantly repeated efforts to discover the right relation between the different means of grace, which attempts all agree only in this that they maintain a specific difference in these effects and that they endeavor to obtain results that go beyond the so-called incomplete conclusions of the symbols and of the older dogmaticians. It is in fact not an easy matter to find ones' way through this wilderness of views entertained by the modern Lutheran theology on the subjects of the sacraments in general and of the Lord's Supper in particular. We therefore confine ourselves as sufficient to our purpose all the more to a sketch and a critique of the principal types and most important representatives of this view; and we will avoid, as far as possible, all repetition of what has already been brought out in the discussion of the subject when treating of baptism.

We will begin with *Martensen*, who indeed (*Die Christl. Dogmatic* § 259-290) not only essentially deviates from the

Lutheran doctrine of the effects but also from the doctrine of the substance of the holy Supper. For in the place of the body and the blood of the Lord he puts the Lord Himself, His whole undivided personality, or, more accurately, the power of the resurrection of Christ which is in the bread that we eat, and in the cup out of which we drink, so that He paraphrases the words of institution in this way: "Take, eat, drink; it is I! here I give to you what is in myself the innermost life-power." The Lord's Supper is not merely a memorial and a giving of thanks for the reconciliation and redemption established by Christ, nor is it merely the holy *pledge* for the renewing of the covenant, but it is at the same time a new "nourishment" of life. The fundamental idea of the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper is the idea of Christ as the head of the *new* creation whose ultimate aim is the redemption and final consummation of the whole perfect human nature. The Lord's Supper is a union with Christ as the *principle* of the holy marriage of the spirit and of nature, which is the ultimate aim of creation. Accordingly the Lutheran conception of the Lord's Supper is Christ-prophetic (*christlich-prophetisch*). This view sees in the Lord's Supper not merely a food for the soul, but a food for the whole *new* man, hence also for the man that shall arise in the resurrection who is already present in embryo and is in the process of development and who will become manifest at the end of time in the image of the glorified body of the Lord. "Hence with Luther we see," says Martensen, "in the Lord's Supper the inseparable union of a mystery of the Holy Spirit and of a holy nature, we recognize that the whole undivided Christ gives Himself in the holy Supper as food for the new man." When however Martensen designates the Christian conception of life in opposition to the antique as the *romantic*, which name is to be given especially to Lutheranism, it may be that the Lutheranism as represented by him is well characterized by this term; but surely the healthy, nourishing fruit of the genuine, sober Lutheran faith and confession has nothing in common with the blue flower of modern Lutheran romanticism.

According to *v. Hofman* (Schriftbeweis 2 Ed. II., 2. p. 201 sqq.) the reception of the body and the blood of Christ, which

takes place solely through the medium of the bread and the wine, brings about a sanctifying effect on the natural life of the believing recipient. Cf. p. 210, where he says: "That which Jesus gave them to eat and drink was adapted to provide for this faith such a natural ground as might conform to and be of benefit to that faith. Page 217: "The bread gives strength; the wine gives courage. When therefore the Lord gives to His disciples bodily to eat His body and drink His blood, such a gift was intended to serve them by enabling them within their natural life to receive strength and courage for the life of faith. — — Within their original nature they become partakers of His nature through a process in their bodily life, in order thereby to secure a natural ground for their life of faith, which is different from but yet related to the former, because it is derived from Him on whom they believe. But such an effect His self-communication has only in those who are and continue to be His disciples: for him who betrayed the Lord it was the cause of all the heavier condemnation, the more terrible the opposition is which such an effect meets in the soul already determined to betray the Lord." Page 219 sq.: "As the One who has already behind Him the torments of death, since He has passed through them to His glorification, He causes the bodily reception of bread and wine, (these products of our earthly life and the means of nourishment and growth of earthly life), to become a bodily reception of His glorified bodily nature, which is the beginning of a bodily world of regeneration and thereby is filled to bring about in the believer a natural ground for a life of faith." Page 244: "In the natural life of the recipient the effect is experienced of that which he receives: either a showing forth of the forgiveness of sin which has been brought about by the death of Christ and is present in His glorification, and which forgiveness gives to the Christian living in the flesh a spiritual power of nature for his life of faith; or a showing forth of the opposition between Christ's nature that has been transformed through atoning death to a glorious estate, and the nature of man lying by birth already under the supremacy of sin, and which (nature) brings to light in the natural life of the recipient the punishment for his sins. Of both of these experiences the Christianity of our day

indeed knows all the less, the less frequently the Lord's Supper is celebrated by them." Finally p. 257: "Whosoever believingly celebrates the Lord's Supper, receives through such bodily eating and drinking of the body and the blood of Christ the heavenly natural ground for his life of faith, which is constantly nourished spiritually through Christ's self-sacrifice, without however faith being required in order to effect the miracle through which Christ gives His body and His blood to be received really, since it is His will to do this whereever the celebration ordained for this purpose takes place on the part of the church. For this reason the unbeliever also receives it when he takes part in the church's celebration of it, but does so only to his judgment and not to his salvation. For an unbeliever also can experience a miracle for himself; but the eating and drinking of which Christ speaks in John 6 presupposes faith and is conditioned by it." In this connection *Hofmann* also remarks, that in the Lord's Supper, differently from baptism, we must not in the first instance and chiefly look to that which the individual experiences, but rather to what the congregation does. Baptism is an incorporation into the communion of the Holy Spirit; the Lord's Supper is the churchly celebration communion with Christ, who is supermundane but yet exists in this bodily life.

In the first place we miss in this connection all scriptural ground for the belief that through the reception of the body of the Lord in the Supper a heavenly natural ground is established. The Lord in the words of institution designates the forgiveness of sin as the purpose of the giving of His body and blood. In the place of this *Hofmann* substitutes a sanctifying transformation of our natural life, which, just because the gift consists of the body of Christ is simply claimed to result and flow of necessity from the partaking of the Lord's body. But this conclusion threatens to destroy the evangelical doctrine of the order of salvation. For according to the unanimous teachings of Scriptures, (which no doctrine of the Lord's Supper can alter or change, but which rather form the immovable basis for every healthy and scriptural doctrine of the Lord's Supper), every subjective saving effect of an objective saving gift is absolutely connected with faith

and finds in this its sole medium. Accordingly an effect which brings about a natural ground, and is therefore beyond a doubt a subjective saving effect, cannot be followed from the mere act of bodily eating and drinking. It is indeed said that this saving effect exists only for the believers, while it is changed into a condemnatory effect for the unbeliever. But there are no saving effects *before* and *outside* of faith which exists only *for* faith, but there is a saving effect only *through* faith. Besides this, bodily eating and drinking is not only the medium of the reception of the body and the blood of the Lord, but is at the same time in itself the means of a sanctifying natural effect, then this must be brought about through and on account of the mere eating and drinking also in the unbeliever notwithstanding his unbelief. The destructive effect could consequently be brought about only subsequently through unbelief. Herein it cannot logically be conceived how a saving effect, which is entirely independent of faith or unfaith, should be annulled through unbelief and be turned into the exact opposite. Or is it to be understood in this way, that the body of Christ, which is received alike by the believer and the unbeliever, immediately and in itself effects its good results only in the believer in view of his faith, but in the unbeliever the destructive results in view of his unbelief? But who would believe that from the glorified body of the God-man, who is full of spirit and salvation and life, as such and immediately any other effect could proceed than that of giving spirit and salvation and life? But the adoption of such a view would undermine the fundamental principle of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper which we here oppose. For then the effect of the Lord's Supper would no longer be conditioned solely by the eating and drinking, but as opposite effects upon faith and unfaith if not conditioned, at least, occasioned by them. One cannot avoid taking into account faith or a want of faith in some way, and yet one cannot conclude either to make all the saving or destructive effects exclusively dependent on them. When finally Hofmann thinks that the Christians of our day have so little to say of these two kinds of experiences (namely, of the saving or of the destructive effect as it takes place in the natural life), since the celebration of the Lord's Supper is so rare, it

often happens that those Christians who partake of the Lord's Supper have no such experiences.

In a manner similar to *Hofmann*, also *Thomasius* sets forth the effect of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Cf. *Christi Person und Werk*, 3. Part, 2. Ed., Div. II., § 70. According to p. 74, Christ's corporeity, through partaking of the blessed bread and wine, enters into us, into our (psychico-physical) nature, into our innermost being and life. "Accordingly the *effect* also takes place within the natural life of man and is not restricted to a bestowal of spiritual powers; it must be in any case a more *real, essential, and natural effect*. This follows from the nature of the Lord's Supper." Thus here also the said effect of the Sacrament is expressly declared a resultant from its essence. A positive Scriptural proof is not adduced, but reference only is made to 1 Cor. 10, 17 and 11, 28-32 in confirmation, and to Eph. 5, 28, 29 as pointing in the same direction. On page 72 we read: "Although the teachings of Holy Writ are so rich in reference to the *essence* of the Supper, yet it says but little concerning the *blessing* thereof. The reason is probably this, that the latter follows naturally from the former." However the Scriptures speak sufficiently concerning the effect or the blessing of the Supper also, if, with the Catechism, we are only content with what they say and do not put in the place of what they say something which they do not say and which it is thought necessary to be deduced from the character of the Supper. In answer to the question wherein the specific and real effect of the Lord's Supper consists, *Thomasius*, p. 47, confesses that he, as *Kahnis*, *Sartorius* and others have done, formerly thought of an effect on the human bodily nature with a view of its later transformation, so that that which Baptism pledges only as a promise the Lord's Supper would begin to realize. But he correctly remarks over against this, that this view has no organic connection with the Scriptural doctrine of the resurrection of the body, and that this fact had made him waver. And yet he has really not to the present day given up this view. For immediately after, on page 77, he says: "And does not this communion (with the glorified body of the Lord) have also a sanctifying effect on our own bodies, and in this way aid *mediately* in their future glorifica-

tion? I submit this as a question, but for my part answer it in the affirmative." Cf. pp. 55, 100. And in truth it can scarcely be conceived how his opinion could be otherwise, if the Lord's Supper is to exert a sanctifying and glorifying effect on the *psychico-physical* natural ground. When Thomasius, moreover, on p. 55 maintains, that only in case the Lord's Supper bestows something that goes beyond Baptism and has a higher effect, can it have a special importance for our salvation: this statement, according to his own elucidation of the different effects of the Lord's Supper and Baptism, virtually amounts to a specific difference. For Baptism also is represented as exerting a sanctifying and glorifying effect on the nature and the whole *psychico-physical* being of men. Thomasius accordingly, p. 49, can speak only of a preservation and development and growth of the new life through the Lord's Supper, which life had been given through Baptism, as he on p. 54 speaks of a specific increase, growth and strengthening of the same. And further what he says of the sacraments as the church-forming powers, which they are represented to be for the very reason that they effect man on the natural side of his being, on that side of his essence which makes him the member of a class, pp. 118, 122, is applicable as well to Baptism as to the Lord's Supper; as it is then also stated, that "baptism transplants man into the organism of Christ, the exalted God-man; and that the Lord's Supper gives him firmer root in this communion;" and that, p. 56, "the communion of those who join in celebrating the Lord's Supper are, in the fullest sense of the word, made the mystic body of the Lord," from all of which certainly only a gradual but no specific difference of saving effect follows.

(To be continued.)

HOMILETICAL DEPARTMENT.

FUNERAL SERMON. REV. 7, 13-17.

BY REV. D. SIMON.

Mourning Friends:

The believer is not without affliction and sorrow. But in the midst of his troubles he is sustained by the comforts of the Gospel. Though he should be brought into the valley and shadow of death, he will fear no evil; for the Lord is with him, and with His rod and staff comforts him.

When the believer mourns the departure of those he loved, he mourns not as those who have no hope. Though the separation through death should be very painful, he knows that not many days hence his sorrow shall be turned into joy. The separation made by the cruel hand of death is only for a season. They shall not return to us, but we shall go where they are. But if we would go where they are we must take the same narrow way upon which they journeyed. As they entered heaven through Christ who is the way, so we must enter through Christ. He is the way to life and the door through which we must enter, if we would enter the place where

OUR SAINTED DEAD DWELL IN HEAVEN.

I.

OUR SAINTED DEAD HAVE BEEN IN GREAT TRIBULATION.

St. John the divine was permitted to look into the kingdom of glory to behold the condition of the sainted dead. He beheld in prophetic numbers an hundred and forty and four thousand of all the tribes of the children of Israel. After this he beheld a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations and kindreds, and people, and tongues. He saw them all clothed in white and engaged in the most blessed service of God. He wondered whence all these people had come. He receives the answer from heaven: "These are they which came out of great tribulation." Now if the

tribulation of our sainted dead are even remembered in heaven, we may dwell on them and think of the tribulations they endured whilst dwelling on earth.

The tribulations of the saints are manifold. They suffer in body, mind and soul. And that which makes the tribulations all the more painful is the fact that sin is the cause of it all. If we were not sinners, we could not suffer. The fact that we suffer forcibly calls to our minds the curse of God pronounced against sin: Thou shalt have sorrow, thou shalt die.

The body suffers from disease. Disease may lay hold of our bodies and cause us pain and distress in any stage and condition of life. The little babe, the youth, these in their best years, and the aged, all are subject to disease and the consequent pains.

Some diseases cut life short, coming upon their victim without warning so that frequently those seemingly in good health to-day are by the morrow lifeless and cold. Other diseases cut away life as it were by inches. Slowly life is ebbing away. Growing a little weaker all the while, yet so gradually that it is scarcely noticeable.

Some diseases are so terrible in their character that only those most intimately connected with the afflicted are at all willing to lend a helping hand. Other diseases leave the body in a condition forcibly reminding us of a plant that has withered and died.

Some diseases may be traced to their origin or cause, the presence of other diseases may not be accounted for.

Many persons most painfully realize that in the sweat of their face they shall eat their bread. The work that seems to be assigned to them exceeds their strength. They become so weary from excessive labor, that often sleep flees from them, and they are required to spend long and dreary nights in sleeplessness. And because of man's weakness, when the work seemingly assigned to him can not be accomplished, worry is added to weariness, which is followed by restless waking, and often by disease.

Tribulations are even of a more serious character. They often reach the mind. The care which comes upon parents respecting their children, how to provide them with food and clothing, how to train them so that they may know how to

provide for themselves, but above all, how to bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, so that they may live in the service of their Redeemer in time and in eternity, such are a few of the troubles that harrass the mind and make this world a vale of tribulation.

Disobedience, disrespect, outright wickedness on the part of children, adds greatly to their distress. These and other troubles, besides physical causes at times entirely disturb the mind, in which case the person becomes insane. Truly, when it comes to this, there is tribulation that may not be described in words.

There are still other tribulations. There are sorrows that effect the soul. The Savior experienced this in all its intensity in Gethsemane and on Calvary. The burden of sin pressed Him to the earth, the curse of God against sin filled His soul with the agonies of eternal death.

Similar distress, though not to be compared with the Savior's in intensity, comes upon the believer. His sins come before his mind in all their enormity, the awful curse of God against sin pierces his soul, and for a season darkness reigns supreme. He fails to call to mind any portion of Scripture that would have the power to banish darkness from his mind, and is therefore for the time on the brink of despair. Such dark hours are shortened that we may not perish; and our temptations never exceed the power of the Gospel through which the Holy Spirit has provided a way of escape.

These are some of the tribulations to which believers are subjected in our day. Whilst these often try men's souls, there have been days of much greater distress, and to which the elder in heaven no doubt refers more directly. He speaks of the days of persecution, when the confession of Christ before men was followed by most terrible tortures and death. These were tribulations so grievous that many were induced to deny Christ, whilst others who remained faithful came forth as gold out of a furnace seven times purified.

II.

OUR SAINTED DEAD HAVE, THROUGH DEATH, COME OUT OF
GREAT TRIBULATION.

Even those who have no hope speak of death ending sickness and pain. They are out of their misery, there suffer-

ing is over, they are at rest, are very common remarks. And shall those who have hope, those who trust in Him who has power over death and the grave, be without comfort in the presence of death! They have the comfort which the children of the world have, and besides a comfort infinitely more valuable.

Those whom they have loved have *come out* of tribulation. They did not escape one distress and get into another, but they have fled away from trouble. We sometimes say that in order to get away from trouble we would needs get out of this world. Now when our loved ones leave this world, may we not conclude that they are out of trouble? Disease and death cannot touch them where they now are. There is nothing there to fill their minds with anxious care. Thick clouds of sorrow, doubt and despair never shut out the light of heaven from their souls, where they now dwell.

But we must not think that death ends the afflictions of all who die. To die is not all of death to those who believe not the Lord Jesus. To the unbelieving death but adds afflictions and intensifies the pains. They leave this vale of tears to enter where there is wailing and gnashing of teeth. The fears which they experienced through an accusing conscience are now fully realized in the torturing flames, and endless despair racks the soul day and night. That is what the Lord Jesus means when He says: He that believeth not shall be damned.

Those have come out of tribulation who *have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.*

We are by nature, as well as by actual transgression, defiled with sin. Our robes are polluted with the filth of earth. Now nothing unholy or unclean shall stand in the presence of God. All our unholiness and uncleanness must be washed away before we can appear before our God, or before we can be permitted to enter into the kingdom of glory. Sin is so deeply seated in our very nature that a leopard may just as easily change his spots, as we may by our efforts remove our sins. And yet we may wash our robes and make them white. There is a bath that removes this filth from the soul and fits it for God's holy presence.

That bath is the blood of the Lamb, even the blood of

Jesus the Son of God. The blood of Jesus Christ the Son of God cleanseth us from all sin. Where the blood of the Lamb has been applied to the soul, the robes have been washed and made white. But who apply the blood of the Lamb to the cleansing of their souls? Those who have come to a knowledge of their sins and recognized the necessity of such a cleansing; and confidently believe that the Lord Jesus suffered for their sins and by His death atoned for them. Those who in all sincerity cast themselves into the arms of Jesus their Savior, depending solely upon His mercy for their salvation.

These come out of their temporal tribulations and escape the eternal tribulations. When such has been the faith of our friends, as indicated by their life and confession and their relation to the Word and Sacraments, we may confidently believe that they have not only put off corruption, but have been freed from every tribulation. They shall suffer no more pain and no more sorrow. The time of sorrow is ended. The journey through the dark and dismal valley of death was their journey to life. Through death they have entered into the unspeakable joys of heaven.

III.

THE CONDITION AND EMPLOYMENT OF OUR SAINTED DEAD IN HEAVEN.

Their condition may be best described by saying that it is the absence of everything that afflicts or distresses, and the presence of everything that rejoices the soul.

The great and original cause of all affliction and distress is sin. Those who have entered the better life have laid off sin. They are no longer sinners. They are perfected saints. On earth they were saints through faith in Jesus' name, although their life was yet full of weaknesses and sin; now they have entered through Christ into the state of perfection.

Since they are free from sin they must also be free from whatever sin has brought upon the human family. "They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more." That does not mean that they shall have no desire for any kind of food or drink, or that there shall be no eating and no drinking of any kind in heaven. If that were the meaning then would

we not be told that the Lamb shall feed them, and lead them unto living fountains of waters. Neither would Christ have spoken to His disciples of drinking the cup anew in His kingdom. These words do not say that the saints shall have no desires, but they say that whatever the desires may be they shall be satisfied. Whatever desire for the food and drink in store for the children of God in heaven may exist, it is abundantly satisfied by the Lamb who feeds them and leads them to living fountains of waters.

There will be no hunger and no thirst in heaven that would distress; there will be no desire for what cannot be had or for what would not satisfy. In heaven the souls are satisfied, they desire only what may be had and what actually benefits the one desiring it.

“God shall wipe all tears from their eyes.” There is no weeping in heaven, and of course no sorrow, and nothing that distresses. This corruption shall have put on incorruption and this mortal shall have put on immortality; that is, these bodies of ours shall no longer be subject to corruption or death. There is no sickness and no pain and no death in the better life. There are no long and dreary nights of pain or anxious care. There are no painful separations there. What makes this world a vale of tears, perhaps more than all things else combined? Is it not the separation of friends by the cruel hand of death? A wife, or husband, a sister or brother, a parent or child or some other intimate friend closes his eyes in death. Torn from the arms of loved ones, the heart bleeds in consequence of the separation. The tears flow copiously, to give relief. Sorrow pent up in the soul would work destruction upon body, mind and soul. Tears let sorrow out and make the burden lighter.

In heaven there will be no sorrow in the soul and therefore no occasion for tears. There are no separations in heaven because there is no death there. They will not experience excessive heat or cold. The sun shall not light on them nor any heat. They have entered a place where there is continual spring, all the surroundings indicating life and pleasure.

They have been separated from all the wicked, as they have been separated from all wickedness. They will hear no more cursing and blaspheming and lying and deceiving.

Their associates will be perfected saints and angels. But above all, "He that sitteth on the throne shall dwell among them." The Lord Jesus, who came upon earth, who lived, suffered and died for us, shall be our companion in heaven. He shall dwell among us. At present Jesus is the Bridegroom and the believers are the bride, through death the Bridegroom receives the bride to Himself into the place He has prepared for her. On earth He clothed His bride with righteousness, in heaven He clothes her with eternal pleasures.

The sainted dead "are before the throne of God and serve Him day and night in His temple." We often speak of our loved ones being at rest. The Word of God gives us the assurance that they have entered into their rest. They rest from their labors. Rest does not mean to cease from labor altogether. A person may be employed and yet rest. Our sainted dead are at rest. And yet they are employed. They serve God, day and night. They are associated with the angels and do angelic work. They praise God for His goodness and thank Him for His mercy. They are engaged in saying: "Amen: Blessing, and glory, and wisdom, and thanksgiving, and honor, and power, and might, be unto our God for ever and ever. Amen."

HOMILETICAL RULES.

FROM J. A. QUENSTED'S "ETHICA PASTORALIS," TRANSLATED
FROM THE GERMAN BY REV. M. R. WALTER.

III. On the day appointed for memorizing the sermon, the preacher should not concern himself about other affairs; he should put away all care, avoid amusements, and also be very considerate regards his diet.

Inasmuch as it is difficult and laborious to speak for whole hours from memory, as the orators of old did, and which the preachers must do now, we, therefore, advise that the preacher—the beginner especially—should, on the day set aside for memorizing the sermon, not concern himself about other matters, studies, or lectures, nor burden his mind with earthly cares. For these things are like weights which op-

press the soul and hinder the soul from rising to spiritual subjects; they are thorns which choke meditation; they are the waters which quench the flame of pious emotions. The mind should be free from diversions and cares; for the faculty which contends with many subjects at the same time becomes too weak to master any one of them properly. The mind should be free from anxiety, for it is remarkable how deleterious this is to the memory. The more cheerful we are, the easier can we meditate. Besides quietness, assuaging the passions, freedom from business and cares, care should be taken regards the diet, that is, moderate use of simple wholesome food and drink. Speakers also recommend for memorizing and meditation, not a very light room but a somewhat darkened apartment, so as to shut out all such things as would agitate the mind and disturb the train of thought and the mental faculties. Some, after they have partaken of a light meal, retire; and about midnight, when the first sleep is past, they arise and commit their discourse to memory; but this method is not in place, because the night is not the season for study. It is far better to rehearse the sermon the day before its delivery, always commencing from the beginning, than to burden the memory with untimely meditation, which is wearisome since at the same time it exhausts the powers of the mind and body ere the time for delivery comes (*Anti Actionem*); for the preacher must take care that he does not, on account of business or meditation or of other studies, ascend the pulpit with weakened and reduced powers, but that he may speak with vigor and force. Dr. John George Grosse says (*Method. Conc., Anh. S. 46*): "On the day you wish to study you should do nothing else. Then, should you awaken in the night, you will be enabled to draw the whole concept immediately before you, and be able to rehearse it readily."

IV. The train of thought in the whole sermon, the disposition, main divisions and the periods within the divisions should be committed to memory.

The herald of the Gospel is expected to possess not only a mind which easily comprehends what is heard and read and be able to retain what has been received, but also to have the capacity readily to present again that which may have

been acquired. He who has to contend much with his memory can scarcely be considered as competent to fill the office of the ministry.

Some laboriously commit their sermons *verbatim et literatim* and confine themselves so closely to the wording of the manuscript when they deliver it from the pulpit, that should a word of the written discourse slip their memory for the moment, they falter, and so confound the context and arrangement of the sermon that they are necessitated to conclude the sermon prematurely. Nearly all disapprove of this method.

Others recommend repeated reading of the sermon, but advise that it be not read too often, inasmuch as multiplied repetitions from memory tend to weaken this faculty. Again others study their sermon by divisions, committing them to memory by repeating them aloud. Then others read only a paragraph at a time, lay the manuscript aside and in silence meditate upon its sense, rehearsing it again and again in their minds. Isidor says in his work "The Highest Good," c. 14: "Silent reading is more agreeable to the mind than loud reading; for the conception of the mind is quicker and more terse when the voice of the reader and meditator is at rest, for reading aloud the same thing repeatedly fatigues the body and weakens the voice." Carl Regius maintains that the pulpit orator should memorize his sermon in an undertone, "Because total silence, on the one hand, calls forth new thoughts, while, on the other hand, by the murmering voice the form of expression is given and the subject matter is impressed more deeply upon the mind." Some advise that the preacher first rehearse the sermon in silence, then in a low undertone, and finally in a loud voice. For in this way the memory is strengthened in a twofold manner, in speaking and hearing. Be this as it may, the preacher should in every case memorize the whole disposition of the sermon, the divisions and the periods they contain.

In order that the disposition may be more readily fixed in the mind it might be written on the margin, or the principal parts of the sermon might be written in a larger hand and their first words should be made prominent so that the whole arrangement may be clearly set in view. Another aid

to memory is, not only to begin each division and period with a new line but also to underscore with a different color the subject, the argument, the principal Scripture passages, and to index all citations on the margin.

Memorizing should be begun immediately after the sermon is written, when the gathered and arranged material is yet vividly before the mind. The morning is considered the best season of the day for memorizing and meditating, because then the mental faculties are yet fresh. Neither should the mind be wearied by continuous repetitions but the thinking powers and memory should be given pauses for rest and recreation. Concerning this Carl Regius remarks (*Orator Christ. bib. X. c. 15.*): "Let the preacher begin to memorize his sermon in good season and not limit his time so as to be necessitated to commit to memory as per force." For such cramming greatly fatigues the mind, disturbs the mental powers and weakens animation so necessary for a lively and energetic delivery.

In his *Consc. Theol.* Tom. I. p. 1042 N. 42, the sainted Dr. Dannhauer inquires, whether in any case it is admissible for the sermon to be delivered by reading it from the manuscript. In his own words he replies: "Why not, in case the memory becomes weak, as through age? The lectures from the cathedra of the Universities are generally read, what should hinder it that in extraordinary cases also the sermon be delivered in the same way from the pulpit? In all other cases the free delivery from memory is the norm which governs good sermonizing, and it is a species of indolence to read from the manuscript in the pulpit."

FOR COMMUNION.

A.

1 COR. 5, 7-8.

Int. a) The Israelites in bondage: "And the Egyptians made the children of Israel to serve with vigor. And they made their lives bitter with hard bondage." Exod. 1, 13-14. b) The Lord's merciful resolve: "And God heard their groaning and their cry came up unto the Lord He remembered His covenant with Abraham and with Israel and with Jacob, and

had respect unto them." Ex. 2, 24-25. *c*) God's charge to Moses: "And the Lord said unto Moses, "I am come down to deliver them out of the land of the Egyptians and bring them out of this land unto a good land and large, unto a land flowing with milk and honey." Exod. 3, 8. *d*) The Lord's miracles by Moses—unavailing. *e*) Slaying of the firstborn in Egypt of man and beast—how the Israelites were spared. *f*) The ordinance of the passover and the feast of unleavened bread as a memorial.

Transitus: All this historical, but at the same time typical of

THE PASCHAL FEAST OF THE NEW COVENANT.

i. e. the Holy Supper of the Lord which we celebrate this day.

I. *The Deliverance which it commemorates*

1. From the hands of Satan and the land of his bondage—God, in our behalf, remembered His covenant with Abraham, etc.
2. By Christ—He, our Moses.
3. Unto the kingdom of God—a good land, etc.

II. *The Lamb which is slain*

1. is Christ—the Lamb of God "without blemish"
2. is slain—as for our deliverance, so for us that we may eat His body and drink His blood to assure us of our redemption.

III. *The Guests who are to eat thereof.*

1. There shall no stranger eat thereof (circumcised slaves, etc. Exod. 12, 44).
2. The children of the covenant—but according to the qualification given.

B.

LUKE 22, 19-22.

Int. The day we celebrate is not only a rest and festival-day, but a feast-day likewise. The Almighty and Holy God Himself is the Host. He has prepared a table for His people. As a Father supremely kind He invites us His children to come and eat and drink and thus be quickened and gladdened by His goodness. Surely, our Lord is good: He fills our

hearts with food and gladness. He regards not our sinfulness and sins. He is mindful of our weaknesses and wants.

Happy they who doubt not but believe. "God, increase our faith." . . .

THE HOLY SUPPER.

- I. *A Seal of God that our sins are forgiven.*
- II. *An Earnest of God that in our warfare against sin we shall obtain the victory.*

Ad. I. The Holy Supper is, and by it are given to us, the body and blood of Christ.

1. "Body . . . blood"—hence Christ incarnate.
2. "Given for . . . shed for"—hence the sacrifice of Christ.
3. "For you . . . for the remission of sins."

Hence, not only has God promised, does He declare, He also exhibits, pardon. What more can He do—can you require?

Transit: But we have a journey before us—danger, etc.

Ad. II. The Holy Supper is food and drink, hence

1. Strengthening of our faith, hope, love,—
2. His strength is made perfect in our weakness unto victory and all its sweet and glorious fruits.

Conc. In the days before us: God with us!

C.

1 COR. 10, 15-17.

Int. We shall to-day make use especially of the 17th verse of our text, for we design to speak of that heavenly relation which Christians sustain to Christ, and the one to the other. The reason for our doing so will become more and more apparent as we proceed—besides, the Supper itself is a sign and seal of that intimate and blessed relation; wherefore communicants ought to be conscious of it.

THE HOLY SUPPER AS A SIGN REPRESENTING,
AND
AS A MEANS FURTHERING THE MOST HOLY AND HAPPY
UNION OF CHRISTIANS.

I. *Exposition.*

1. The teachings of the Holy Scripture concerning the

union of Christ with Christians, and of these the one with the other.

a) As proof of Christ's union with Christians.

John 14, 23. Jesus says: "If a man love me (is a Christian), he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and *we* will come unto him (the Godhead will come *personally*), and make our abode with him.

Ib. 15, 4. "I am the vine, ye are the branches. He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit; for without me ye can do nothing—said Jesus to those who are clean through the word which He spoke. Ib. v. 3.

Hence what good we do is Christ's and *vice versa* for

Gal. 2, 20. Paul says: "I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me . . . by faith.

Hosea 2, 19. "And I will betroth thee unto me for ever; yea, I will betroth thee unto me in righteousness, and in judgment, and in loving kindness, and in mercies. Cant. 6, 3.

Eph. 5, 30-32. "For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh.

This is a great mystery: but I speak concerning Christ and the Church.

Col. 1, 18. "And He is the head of the body, the Church.

b) As proof of the union of Christians with Christ.

John 17, 20-24. "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their words. That they *all* may *be one*, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be *one in us*: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one, etc.

Rom. 12, 4. 5. "For as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office: so we, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another.

2. The holy Supper as a sign representing.

- a) Text v. 17.
- b) Luther's comment upon this passage is substantially: As long as the wheat is not reduced to flour, each grain preserves its individuality; but when the wheat is reduced to flour and the flour baked into bread, the grains lose their individuality, they being inseparably mixed and irretrievably lost the one into the other.

The same takes place with the grapes when pressed into wine.

Application to Christians: "*one bread, one body.*"

- 3. The holy Supper as a means furthering.
 - a) The sacramental elements of bread and wine are not empty nor impotent signs, for Text v. 16.
 - b) "We being many are one bread and one body" (says the Apostle), for we are all, etc., v. 17, thus assigning our participation in the holy Supper as to some extent the cause and reason of our oneness.

Because Christians are perfect in one by the Word of God, they all partake of the same bread and the same cup and thereby their oneness is confirmed, strengthened, but also manifested.

II. *Application.*

- 1. The immediate benefits of this union are:
 - a) That the person, work, and glories of Christ are bestowed upon Christians, and
 - b) That Christians are with all that they are, and do, the Lord's, and
 - c) That Christians, in the Lord, belong the one to the other in all they are and have and do.

The same in their natures—divine. Having "all things common" not in an external equality of goods, but rather a communication of goods in the bond of perfection—love.

Diversities of operation, but the same Lord working all in all, etc.

- 2. In how far is this union realized and are these benefits enjoyed among us.
 - a) Notwithstanding all faithfulness—imperfect. But

- b) Even faithfulness seems to be wanting with many.
- c) While celebrating the Lord's Supper to-day as a true feast of our union with the Lord and His Church, let us remember that it is a true feast of *Re-union*, inasmuch as the Lord offers us pardon of our shortcomings in the past, and grace from on high to be more faithful in the future, which we also promise!

D.

1 COR. 10, 15-17.

Int. a) I speak as to wise men; b) judge ye what I say. 15.

THE HOLY SUPPER, A MEMORIAL OF THE LOVE OF CHRIST AND OF CHRISTIANS.

Transitus: "This do in remembrance of me, a) to Jesus' glory; b) to others an example.

I. *Inasmuch as it reminds us of the Love of Christ to us.*

- 1. Christ's Love—for in the supper He imparts Himself to us! Text, etc.
 - a) Christ loved the Church and gave Himself for it. Eph. 5, 25.
 - b) God is love. In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent His only begotten Son into the world that we might live through Him." 1 John 4, 8. 9.
- 2. Christ's suffering Love—for it is the body broken and the blood shed which, etc.
 - a) "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends. John 15, 13 and lo!"—while we were yet sinners Christ died for us. Rom. 5, 8; 6. 7.
 - b) broken—shed a) by us, and b) for us sinners: Oh the abomination—the sting of our sins! Oh the infinite love of Jesus!

3. Christ's triumphant Love—for it is the body, the blood, glorified, which, etc.
 - a) His conquest. Rom. 8, 34, etc.
 - b) "We are more than conquerors through Him that loved us." Ib. 37.

II. *Inasmuch as it reminds us of the Love of Christians*

1. which they owe to Christ.
 - a) "We love Him because He first loved us. 1 John. 4, 19, etc.
 - b) "If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." John 14, 23.
2. which they owe to one another. Text:
 - a) "Walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given Himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savor." Eph. 5, 2.
"A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another, as I have loved you that ye also love one another, John 13, 34.
 - b) Verily, I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." Matt. 25, 40.

E.

1 COR. 11, 26.

Int. The Holy Supper of our Lord is chiefly a means of grace, i. e. an instrument whereby God brings near to us for our acceptance the rich treasures of His redeeming love, such as But in connection with this means of God's appointment, duties are also imposed on us by His sovereign Love. As we learn from the words of our text, we are not only to take something but also to do something whenever we present ourselves at the table of our Lord: "As often as ye . . . come." It is not so much the benefits we receive by eating and drinking of the Supper as the holy significance of the eating and

drinking which, this day, I desire you to consider with me. For the very act of presenting yourselves at this Altar is, in reality, the most solemn part of the worship with which you honor the Lord your God. You thereby make a public confession of your faith, of your whole Christian faith, and especially of that part of the faith which is denied by so many who bear the Christian name, and which for that reason must be the more important and acceptable before God.

THE PRECIOUS CONFESSiON WHICH IS MADE BY THOSE
WHO RECEIVE THE LORD'S SUPPER IN THE FAITH OF
OUR CHURCH.

Lord sanctify us by Thy Truth, Thy Word is Truth.

I. *With respect to Christ, His Person and Work, we believe and there confess*

1. that He is the very Son of God come down from heaven and made man . . was given for us, etc.,
2. that He is very present with His body and blood for our salvation.

II. *With respect to ourselves we believe and there confess*

1. that we are sinners,
2. that our only help is Christ,
3. that we desire Him as our Savior and own Him as our Lord.

III. *With respect to each other we believe and there confess*

1. that we all are one body in Christ,
2. that we should love and bless one another.

Conc. By the celebration of the Supper we declare ourselves separated from all who reject our faith.

To-day also while you commune, "ye do show forth the Lord's death. . ." Continue to do so till He come and you will receive a crown of life. Amen! C. H. L. S.

THE COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

This Magazine is designed to supply the want, long since felt, of a Lutheran periodical devoted to theological discussion. Its aim will be the exposition and defence of the doctrines of the Church as confessed in the Book of Concord. Theology in all its departments is embraced within its scope, though for the present special attention will be given to the controverted subject of predestination.

1. The Magazine is published bi-monthly, each number containing 64 pages.

2. The terms are \$2.00 per annum, payable in advance, which includes postage. Single numbers 35 cents.

3. All remittances should be addressed to J. L. Trauger, Agent, Columbus, O. All Communications pertaining to the Editorial Department to Prof. M. Loy, Columbus, O.

The friends of the Magazine are requested to give such aid in its circulation as their circumstances permit.

CONTENTS OF No. III.

	PAGE.
1. THE ALLOTROEPISCOPOS IN THE CHURCH	129
2. SOME MISTAKES OF SCIENTISTS	145
3. THE DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER, ETC.....	154
4. HOMILETICAL DEPARTMENT	175

Monies Received for Volume V.

Louis Hamrick \$2.00 in full. H. T. Lerdall, G. Long, Revs. G. M. Schmucker, C. H. Rohe, H. J. Reiman, Th. H. Jaeger, H. F. Belser, F. Schillinger, K. Skyburg, W. A. Bowman, G. Weber, J. P. Hentz, F. H. Patzer, M. L. Carpenter each \$2.00. Revs. M. Walter, D. Simon, W. G. Nicol each \$4.00. F. Damrow, Student, E. W. Cooperrider each \$1. Rev. D. M. Martens \$6.00. J. C Stolzenbach \$7.00 in full.

C O L U M B U S

THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

A BI-MONTHLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF
THE EV. LUTHERAN CHURCH.

EDITED BY THE FACULTY OF CAPITAL UNIVERSITY.

VOL. V.—No. IV.

A U G U S T, 1885.

COLUMBUS, OHIO:
LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN OF THE OHIO SYNOD.
1885.

T H E

COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

VOL. V.

AUGUST, 1885.

No. 4.

THE WILL IN CONVERSION.

PART I. FALSE THEORIES.

To those who believe the truth of revelation and rejoice in the hope of future glory through our Lord Jesus Christ, the most important question in the doctrine of the human will is that which pertains to its relation to divine grace in the work of conversion. Infinitely superior to all questions of science respecting God's creatures is the truth in Jesus, through which eternal happiness is secured. We have endeavored to set forth the nature, powers, and present condition of the human will, appealing to all natural sources as well as to the supernatural revelation given in the Holy Scriptures to establish our positions. This has seemed to us important in itself. The science of the soul is certainly as worthy of study for its own sake as the science of any of God's wonderful works. But infinitely more important is the truth unto salvation. We have borne this in mind, and desired to utilize, in an inquiry more directly theological, the results attained. This inquiry pertains to the powers and office of the will in regard to things spiritual, and especially in the work of conversion, which is indispensable to salvation. It is an inquiry that is beset with difficulties and that necessitates opposition to theories that have numerous advocates and defenders, many of whom are men of unquestioned ability and manifest piety. We desire to impugn the sincerity of none of them, but have earnestly sought and shall endeavor humbly to set forth and maintain the truth. To this we are all the more urged because there are errors circu-

lated among us whose tendency is dangerous in the extreme, and to which we must first give attention.

There certainly is room, without questioning the doctrine of salvation by grace alone, for the inquiry whether man's will has any power or any office in this regard. There is room for the inquiry whether God, who has provided the eternal redemption through the gift of His own dear Son, and who bestows the Holy Spirit that we may embrace Him as our Savior, does not, according to His all-wise purpose in creation and in redemption, require the action of our will before we can be numbered among His people and be heirs of eternal life in Christ.

And there is need for this inquiry. The teaching of Holy Scripture is such that it is forced upon us. For these Scriptures teach, on the one hand, that God "will have all men to be saved and to come unto the knowledge of the truth," 2 Tim. 2, 4, and, on the other hand, that "strait is the gate and narrow is the way which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it," Matt. 7, 14. The matter is summed up in our Lord's words: "Many are called, but few are chosen," Matt. 22, 14. The fact is manifest beyond all controversy, that although God desires the salvation of all men, but few are saved in fact. This challenges reflection. It would seem to imply that very much depends upon the human will, notwithstanding the undisputed fact that God alone is our Savior.

There are several easy solutions of the problem presented in the facts before us, and they are enticing because they are so easy. One is that man's will has nothing whatever to do with the matter of his salvation, but that all depends absolutely upon God's will, and that He selects the people whom He intends to save from destruction. That explains it all. He is absolute Sovereign and can do what He pleases. If He pleases to save some and let the others perish, all is clear enough why some are saved and some are lost. Another theory is that God leaves the matter of salvation altogether in the hands of man, laying down the conditions of eternal life and referring the choice of fulfilling or refusing to fulfill these conditions to the powers of nature in the human will. That too explains all. Man may choose life or death, and as

he chooses, so is the result. Both are plausible theories and both are accepted by large numbers. But both are unscriptural, and therefore must be rejected, however attractive they may be to human reason as easy solutions of a perplexing problem.

I. The first answer, that God is sovereign Lord, upon whose absolute will the salvation or damnation of each individual must ultimately depend, and that He accordingly has decreed from all eternity who shall be saved and who shall not, such decree being in no way contingent upon any possible action of the human will, is utterly without foundation. That He is God and therefore sovereign Lord of all, no Christian can think of denying. But His sovereignty does not imply that He can have no regard to the will and welfare of His intelligent creatures, or that such a power as the human will can have no recognized existence in the matter of salvation. It does not imply that God absolutely determines everything and by His almighty power executes what He has determined, so that there is nothing and can be nothing contingent. To argue from the sovereignty and omnipotence of God that all things exist and move by necessity, and that even the human will is not exempt from such force, but is inevitably determined by it, is merely a refined species of rationalism that seems to honor God by ascribing all power and glory to Him, but that dishonors Him by failing to heed the revelation which is given in His Word and making logical deductions that conflict with its teaching. For in the Holy Scriptures God has made known to us that He does, in the whole economy of grace as well as in the whole government of the world by His providence, take into account the human will. This theory entirely misrepresents God by denying His mercy to the largest portion of the human race. It makes God a tyrant to be dreaded, instead of a Father to be loved.

1. Such a God the Scriptures do not reveal. The God of the Scriptures is "the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth." Ex. 34, 6. "The Lord is merciful and gracious, slow to anger and plenteous in mercy. He will not always chide, neither will He keep His anger forever. He hath not dealt with us after

our sins nor rewarded us according to our iniquities." Ps. 103, 8-10. "The Lord is gracious and full of compassion, slow to anger and of great mercy." Ps. 135, 8. "Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father also is merciful." Luke 6, 36. "I say unto you, love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you; for He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust." Matt. 5, 44, 45. "He that loveth not, knoweth not God; for God is love. In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent His only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through Him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins." 1 John 4, 8-10. Nor is this loving God merciful and gracious only in temporal things, or only towards a part of His creatures. "The Lord is good to all, and His tender mercies are over all His works." Ps. 145, 9. "God is no respecter of persons." Acts 10, 34. "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved." John 3, 16, 17. God loved the world, not only a portion of it, and the only begotten Son came to save not only a select few, but to lay down His life for the sins of the whole world. "For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave Himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time." 1 Tim. 2, 5, 6. "We thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead; and that He died for all, that they which live should henceforth not live unto themselves, but unto Him which died for them, and rose again." 2 Cor. 5, 14, 15. Even for those who perish the merciful Savior gave His life as a ransom, that they might not perish, but have everlasting life. "Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died." Rom. 14, 15. "Through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish, for whom Christ died?" 1 Cor. 8, 11.

Nor can those who seek at all hazards to uphold an unscriptural theory find any semblance of justification in an

appeal to the difference between a universal redemption and a universal will of God to save all men. The mission of the Son is the manifestation of the Father's will. As many as He was sent to save so many it was the will of God to save. He died for all, and therefore it was the good pleasure of our gracious Lord and God that all should have life. The object was that the world through Him should be saved. But even when such a distinction is made between the object of the Savior's work and that of the Holy Spirit's mission, nothing is gained for the theory of an absolute decree. There is the same obstacle of Holy Scripture in the way of the theory of a grace as in that of a limited atonement. The Bible teaches expressly that God would have all men come to Christ and be saved as well as that Christ died for all. There is in the sense of a selection from among a number, no more an election unto faith than there is an election unto redemption. As God sent His Son to die for all, so He would have all believe and be saved. The idea that God so loved the world as to give His only begotten Son that the world through Him might be saved, and that He then resolved to give the faith necessary to such salvation only to a favored portion of that world, is self-contradictory. "He that spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things?" Rom. 8, 32. The thought is preposterous that God, in order to save His fallen creatures from everlasting woe, should give to the world His dearest treasure, and then withhold from the vast majority of His miserable creatures for whom the eternal Son suffered, the gift necessary to render that treasure available for His merciful purpose. Such thoughts are inexcusable. They are the more inexcusable as the Holy Spirit explicitly says: "As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live: turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; for why will ye die, O house of Israel." Ez. 33, 11. It has the appearance of wantonness, in the face of such statements, to allege that the apostle, when he speaks of our election unto the adoption of children "according to the good pleasure of His will," (Eph. 1, 5), means that it was the good pleasure of our merciful God, whose tender mercies are over all His works, to save

from endless misery only a small portion of our ruined race—that it was His good pleasure to consign them all, with the exception of a select few, to the realms of everlasting darkness and woe, where there is weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth; or at least that it was not His good pleasure to save any but that favored numbered whom He chose, according to the good pleasure of His will, to make believers and thus to save. His good pleasure was that all should believe 'n His beloved Son, whom He sent into the world to save all, and who offered Himself as a ransom for all, and that all through faith in His name should inherit everlasting life. "For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Savior, who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth." 1 Tim. 2, 4. The Scriptures are clear, and nothing in them is clearer than this, that God's will is the salvation of all men. He has no pleasure in the death of any sinner, however vile He may be, and He has pleasure in saving all through faith in Jesus. He would have them all come to the knowledge of the truth and be saved by embracing it. Not only does the Holy Spirit assure us that God has no pleasure in the death of the sinner, but He expressly and explicitly assures us that He has pleasure in the sinner's salvation. "The Lord is not slack concerning His promises, as some men count slackness, but is long-suffering to usward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." 2 Pet. 3, 9. There is therefore no ground but such as may be found in blind human reason to maintain, that our gracious Lord desires and makes provision for the salvation of only a select few of the human souls that are perishing in sin. He loved the world; He sent His Son as a ransom for all; He sincerely calls all sinners by the Gospel; He would have all to be saved. Any theory, therefore, that represents God as the cause of the difference in the final destiny of men, some being saved and some being forever lost—that, in other words, represents God, who alone can save, as desiring the salvation of only a favored few, and therefore absolutely electing them to that faith by which alone salvation is possible, while He did not desire the salvation of the large majority of the race, and therefore predestinated them to the everlasting agony of hell, and at least

did not rescue them by efficaciously willing their salvation, but left them to their righteous doom of eternal torture—any such theory conflicts with the truth concerning God which the Scriptures reveal, and represent Him as a cruel despot whom the Scriptures do not recognize as God, and do not teach us to believe in and worship. Our God is a God of love and of salvation, who has no pleasure in any sinner's death, but desires that all should be saved through the blood of His own dear Son that was shed for all. Those who entertain the conception of a God who is just, indeed, inasmuch as He consigns the sinner to the punishment which his transgressions have merited, but is not merciful, inasmuch as He could save whom He pleased, but did not please to save all, have followed their own fancy, not the Scriptures.

2. The theory that God, without any reference to the human will, absolutely decides who shall be saved, militates also against the nature of man as an intelligent creature endowed with will. That man is such a creature needs no proof. He could not have fallen if His Maker had not endowed him with the power of choice. If it had pleased God to make man like the mineral or vegetable or brute, endowing him with powers that would work out their destiny without any thinking or willing on their part, man never could have deviated from the course which God had marked out for him and which he would have pursued by the necessity of his nature. He could, in that case, never have fallen, because he would, like the mineral and vegetable and brute, have possessed no power of choice and no moral responsibility, but would have moved on to His final destiny without merit or demerit, without obligation or responsibility, without reward or punishment. Duty and desert are equally inconceivable where there is no choice. The flower that blooms has no merit; the rock that falls deserves no censure. Man fell, and the fall was sinful and the wages was death. But this was because he had choice, so that it might have been otherwise. He was not necessitated to do as he did. He could not say that he had no responsibility in the matter. It was his doing, not God's; it was his doing in opposition to the express will of God. A creature with the power of choice is, in view of God's government of all, an amazing fact; and the mystery

looms up in more startling magnitude when this choice is seen to be exercised in opposition to the will of the Creator. But the fact is plain, whether we can comprehend it or not. It is sheer folly to deny it in order to save a theory. If there was no freedom of choice when man fell, but merely a necessitated action, in which the creature did what God ordained, and in which he worked out his destiny as God had made him to work it out and as by the necessity of his created nature he must work it out, it is absurd to talk about sin in such accomplishment of the divine will, and heartless to talk about pain and penalty as the final result of such accomplishment of a good Creator's purpose. A merciful Maker may lead through temporal affliction to eternal happiness, but cannot make eternal misery the outcome of His own necessitation. It pleased the Creator in His goodness and wisdom to make creatures with wills, and in the exercise of his own will man disobeyed God. How God could permit this—in other words, why God formed such creature with all the possibilities of misery in his nature—it is not for us to determine. So it seemed good in His sight, who doeth all things well. But it is preposterous to insist that man, whose redemption through Christ is part of that wonderful plan according to which he was made and is governed, had a will to choose between good and evil and life and death, but that after the evil was chosen his will should have nothing further to do with his destiny. That would have been the case if God in His righteousness had consigned the sinner at once to his endless doom. His damnation would have been just. God owes no sinner salvation; the sinner's due is damnation. But the whole revelation given us in the Scriptures warrant us in saying that if God had thus dealt with the sinner the only begotten Son would never have become man and the sinful race would never have been propagated. Adam and Eve would have been cut off on the day they sinned, and the terrible wages of sin would have been confined to them. In short, the whole plan of God in the creation and government and destiny of this earth would have been different. Certain it is that God reveals Himself as a good Lord who has thoughts of mercy towards men. He is not only their Maker and Ruler, but also their Savior. And in executing that

amazing plan of infinite love to save lost souls He deals with men as the intelligent creatures whom He was pleased to endow with will. Those creatures used that endowment in the fearful catastrophe of Eden against the Creator's design, and may use it still against their Redeemer's purpose. But in no case is it ignored.

As man in the fall was not necessitated to abide in holiness, so now he is not necessitated to be renewed after the image of God; as in the fall he was not necessitated to eat the forbidden fruit and sin against God, so now, when the Word of salvation is sent to him, he is not necessitated to remain in sin and spiritual death. His Maker has not forgotten that he has a will.

There is no divine ordinance according to which some *must* believe, without any reference to their will; there is no divine ordinance according to which some *must* remain in unbelief, without any reference to their will. The grace of God is not irresistible; the power of sin is not irresistible when grace invites to salvation. God would have all men to be saved, His call is sincere, and all that is necessary for compliance is graciously offered in the Gospel, which is the power of God unto salvation.

The doctrine that grace saves those whom God designs to save, so that these *must* be converted and believe unto salvation, while, as a necessary consequence, the rest of mankind, because that electing grace which alone makes salvation is withheld from them, *must* remain in unbelief or at least *must* die in unbelief and necessarily perish, thus conflicts as decidedly with the nature of man as it does with the nature of God. It manifestly makes man a helpless machine that runs as its Maker ordains it to run, and that inevitably accomplishes the end for which the Creator designed it. It just as manifestly makes sin a physical, not a moral evil, inasmuch as it leaves no room for any moral action on the part of man, which is obviously out of the question where there is no power of choice; and again just as manifestly it makes God responsible for any evil that may be found in the running of the machine that has no choice and therefore can have no responsibility.

Such a theory conceives man as a helpless instrument in

the hands of its Maker, who may draw it to heaven or cast it to hell according to His pleasure, although neither the mercy of the one nor the justice of the other act would be apparent, when the object is conceived as having no choice and therefore as having no accountability.

If those who hold this view reply that they still regard man as an intelligent being, and even as having a will, but that he is in such a condition because of sin that he can make no use of his will in the matter of his salvation, they succeed in presenting the subject in a different aspect, but the result is the same. They still strive against the nature of man as God made him and represents him in His Word; for they represent sin to be his essence, so that nothing but a physical operation could furnish a remedy for its destructive power.

Sin is an unutterable evil that brings everlasting death in its train. But it is not the essence of man. He existed before it came into the world, and can exist again without it in the blissful mansions whence it is forever excluded. If man by the fall became a being that inherently never could will the good again, though he could will it before that deplorable catastrophe, he is not essentially the same creature that fell; if man after conversion can will the good again that he could not, by the inherent constitution of his nature, will before, he is not after conversion essentially the same being that he was before. Morally he cannot do what he could before the fall, but physically he is the same. That man cannot, in his present condition of bondage under sin, will anything spiritually good, we have not only admitted, but have shown at some length in a former article. But this bondage, although it sadly effects his condition, does not change his essence, as it does not change the essence of a man to bind him in chains, although it does greatly circumscribe his powers. He still has the natural power to move about, but he cannot break his chains and therefore cannot use his power. So the man who knows nothing of Dante or Milton, but does know of sensual enjoyments, cannot admire the sombre scenes of the one or the majestic images of the other. He cannot, not because he is not made like other men who do enjoy Dante and Milton, but because his circum-

stances have not given play to all the possibilities of his nature. We see very well that the analogy is not perfect. Between spiritual and natural things there never can be a perfect analogy. But the point in view is thus fairly illustrated. A man cannot love Milton as long as his intellect has not the necessary light and his affections have therefore no opportunity to act. He might have light and still not love Milton, because the motives presented by the head do not work irresistibly upon the heart. But he cannot love Milton so long as the intellect does not present the object and furnish the conditions of a motive. So man cannot love the good, or God, who is good, so long as that object is not presented to his mind as one of the objects lying within the possibilities of his choice. He cannot will that which he does not know and therefore has not the possibility of desiring. But neither can he love God or saving truth when the Word presents them to his mind. For this a spiritual power is necessary which is lost by the fall and which never belonged to man's essence. But the possibility of knowing and accepting the truth does lie within the compass of man's original endowment, and he would no longer be essentially what God made him if he needed any essential change to render him capable of willing the good. Can he then will the spiritually good? Physically he has the power to do it, though morally he has not: that is to say, he was endowed in his creation with the power of will, within the scope of which lay righteousness as well as sin, and that power he has never lost and could not lose without becoming an essentially different creature; whilst he has, through the abuse of this power, lost the moral ability to choose what he was by natural endowment empowered and designed to choose. Sin is a moral corruption, and not a physical destruction. Without help from above he never can again work righteousness and never can please His righteous Maker. The ability to use his natural endowment in this direction is entirely gone, and in this respect he is dead. If he is left to himself, he remains in this death and goes to his eternal doom. But he need not undergo a change of essence to be again rendered able to discern and delight in spiritual things. He has not become a stone or a plant or a brute: he is still man, with all the powers that essentially

belong to man, which includes will as one of the chief and most conspicuous. Man did not cease, when he fell, to be essentially what God made him; he does not cease, when he is regenerated, to be essentially what he was. In both cases he remains man.

Our Confessions carefully discriminate between man and the sin which clings to him, so that man remains essentially man, notwithstanding the depravity which the fall has caused. They say: "Although in Adam and Eve the nature was originally created pure, good, and holy, nevertheless sin has not entered nature through the fall in the way fanatically taught by the Manichaeans, as though Satan had created or made something essentially evil and mingled it with their nature. But since, from the seduction of Satan, through the fall, according to God's judgment and sentence, man, as a punishment, has lost his concreated original righteousness, human nature, as has been said above, is perverted and corrupt by this deprivation or deficiency, want, and injury, which has been caused by Satan; so that at present the nature of all men, who in a natural way are conceived and born, is transmitted by inheritance with the same want and corruption. For since the fall human nature is not at first created pure and good, and only afterward corrupted by original sin, but in the first moment of our conception the seed whence man is formed is sinful and corrupt. Thus also original sin is something existing of itself in us apart from the nature of the corrupt man, as it is also not the peculiar essence, body or soul, of the corrupt man, or the man himself." Form. Conc. II. cap. 2, § 27, 28. Sin is not the essence of man, but something that corrupts the whole being, which remains essentially what God created it. It neither transsubstantiates man into a different creature, nor forms a distinct entity in man side by side with the entity which God made as man. There is not, after the fall, a dual essence, one being man as God made him, the other being a distinct substance of evil which the devil made. Satan is no creator; he can mar what God has made, but he can make nothing. Sin is a corruption of the nature which God has made, but changes that nature in no essential respect. The essential powers that man had before the fall he has still; but they are corrupted by the acts

of Satan. "We believe, teach and confess, that there is a distinction between man's nature, not only as he was originally created by God, pure and holy and without sin, but also as we have it now since the fall, namely, between the nature itself, which even since the fall is and remains a creature of God, and original sin; and that this distinction is as great as the distinction between a work of God and a work of the devil. We believe, teach and confess, also, that this distinction should be maintained with the greatest care, because the dogma that no distinction is to be made between our corrupt human nature and original sin conflicts with the chief articles of our Christian faith concerning creation, redemption, sanctification, and the resurrection of our body, and cannot co-exist therewith. For God created not only the body and soul of Adam and Eve before the fall, but also our bodies and souls since the fall, notwithstanding that they are corrupt, which God still acknowledges as His work, as it is written Job 10, 8: "Thine hands have made me and fashioned me together round about." This human nature, nevertheless without sin, and therefore not of other's but our own flesh, the Son of God has assumed into the unity of His person and according to it become our true brother. Heb. 2, 14: 'Forasmuch then as the children were partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same.' Again v. 16, 4, 15: 'He took not on Him the nature of angels, but He took on Him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things it behooved Him to be made like unto His brethren, yet without sin.' Therefore Christ has redeemed it, as His work; sanctifies it, as His work; raises it from the dead and gloriously adorns it, as His work. But original sin He has not created, assumed, redeemed, sanctified; He also will not raise it, or with the elect adorn or save it, but in the resurrection it will be entirely destroyed. Hence the distinction between the corrupt nature and the corruption which infects the nature, and by which the nature became corrupt, can easily be discerned."

Form. Conc. I, cap 1, § 3-7. Our fathers clearly saw that sin does not in any way change the essence of that which it corrupts, and that the human nature which is effected by it could still be assumed by our Lord without assuming the sin, and could in the saints of God be taken to heaven with-

out introducing sin into that abode of purity and bliss. Man's nature is not sin, but is what God made it in the beginning. All the essential powers belonging to it remain after the fall, which produced no essential change in the creature endowed with intelligence, feeling, and will. Physically, that is, so far as the constitution of his nature is concerned, he can still know and feel and will as he could before. There need be no new substance created, or no new essence wrought in that substance, to enable man to know and feel and will spiritual things. What is requisite for this is a purification of the nature which already exists and of the powers that belong to it in virtue of its original endowment.

Sin is a moral, not a physical evil. It came not by a change in the physical constitution of man, so that he by its introduction became substantially or essentially a different creature from what he was before, but by a volitional action of the moral being whom God had created. So the renewal of man after the image of God in righteousness and true holiness can not take place without another volitional action under the influence of divine grace. We are far from denying that the Holy Ghost must work a change in the soul prior to the will's decision to follow Christ; but His end is not attained without a new generic volition.

The theory that God absolutely elects some to eternal life and therefore necessitates their conversion and perseverance, whilst all the others are left without that special and irresistible grace which alone can effect such conversion and perseverance, assumes that man has undergone a physical change in virtue of the fall, and can be converted only by another physical change that restores to him the faculties lost by the unhappy act of his will in Paradise. The nature of the unconverted man could thus not be essentially the same which God created, and the converted person would not be essentially the same as the sinner that is said to be converted. Sin would thus be regarded as constituting the essence of man, the removal of which would be the destruction of the creature bearing that name. Conversion would thus be not the change of a being that exists as man, but the creation by almighty powers of an essentially different being, who is substituted for the annihilated sinner. Against such a theory the

Bible and the Church are equally emphatic in pronouncing condemnation.

The Scriptures uniformly address man as physically capable of complying with its requirements. It is true, as Luther and others before and after him have argued, that divine commands given to men do not necessarily imply the power of fulfilling them. But that does not settle the question under consideration. They do not imply the possession of moral power to obey. Both Scripture and experience show that fallen man lacks such power. He cannot obey the command: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind," which is the first and great commandment. Nor can he fulfill the second which is like unto it: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." If man had the ability to keep these great commandments, it would not have been necessary that Christ should die to save him. Neither can he, now that the redemption is accomplished and salvation is secured for all through the sacrifice of the incarnate Son, believe on Him that he might be saved. These are divine requirements for which there is no human power of obedience. But that is only a partial presentation of the matter involved. The other element in the question will become apparent when we inquire whether such requirements would or could have been made of creatures that had not the physical power of compliance. Does any one suppose that God would issue such commands to a mineral or a vegetable or an irrational animal? These cannot love God and man, and they cannot believe in Christ, the incarnate Son of God. Neither can man as he is by nature, captive as he is under sin. But is his case, now that he is fallen, the same as that of stone and plant and brute? These were not made to love God; they never transgressed divine law and never could sin; they needed not that God should purchase them with His own blood. They were not endowed with the same power as man; they were physically or naturally otherwise constituted; they never could and never were designed to choose their path, and never did and never could violate His will. Has man, because of his sin, become as one of them? All humanity cries that he has not, and all revelation supports the cry. He is still man; he has sinned

and fallen, O how deeply, but he is still man; he is ruined, but he is man in ruins. It would be exalting sinful man to give him a place among the creatures that never fell and never ceased to be good as God made them. He has fallen far below the brutes, as he was created far above them. He sinned, and that tells a tale of horror. He is sold under sin, and that reveals unutterable woe. But he is not a devil, as he is not a brute. No such appeals are made to devils, and no such appeals are made to irrational creatures, as those which are made to man. Neither to brutes nor to devils is it said: "Repent, and turn yourselves from all your transgressions, so iniquity shall not be your ruin. Cast away from you all your transgression, whereby ye have transgressed, and make you a new heart and a new spirit; for why will ye die, O house of Israel? For I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth, saith the Lord God: wherefore turn yourselves and live ye." Ezek. 18, 30-32. Neither to devils nor to earthly creatures other than man is it said: "We ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip. For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompence of reward, how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation?" Heb. 2, 1-3. It is employing reason—poor, blind reason—against the whole body of revelation—against all its pre-suppositions and all its contents—to argue that man, lost and ruined by the fall is no longer a being capable of right volitions. Morally he is incapable, but he has not therefore lost the powers of human nature. He is man, and has not in virtue of sin become anything else. He is still a moral creature, though in ruins, and the gracious God that desires to save him, still treats him as a moral creature, though in ruins. He would save the creature that has fallen, not annihilate the human race as a divine failure that is to be replaced by a creature essentially different. He would save me, who write, and you, who read, not destroy us and by His almighty power create other persons who under our names should behold His face in the glory which you and I should never behold.

Notwithstanding the fall, man has a capacity to be saved. He retains his identity. The soul that is saved by faith in

the Lord Jesus is the same soul that was lost by reason of its inherited sin. It is diseased, and only the grace of God can heal it; but it is still a soul that retains the power of willing as well as of knowing and feeling, and by the constitution of its nature can will the good as well as the evil, although in its diseased condition the good is beyond its reach. Sin is an accident that corrupts the whole nature of man, not an essence which is substituted for that which once constituted man. The sinner is still man.

This theory which, as we have seen, contravenes the nature of God and of man, is generally known in theology by the name of Calvinism, while in philosophy it is called determinism or necessitarianism. It is held in various modifications from the extreme particularism of the school of Beza to the hypothetical universalism of the school of Amyrald; but in all its variations it has the one essential feature which solves the problem of divine government and human will, as related to man's salvation, by assuming that God selects the persons in whom faith is to be wrought and upon whom eternal life is to be bestowed, and that He by His power accomplishes in these—only in these—His gracious purpose to save them. This removes the difficulty and makes the whole matter plain. Why some believe and are saved and others do not and are damned, thus involves no mystery to human reason, unless the contradiction between the human theory and the divine revelation be regarded as a mystery. The purpose of God decides all. Some believe because God has ordained that they shall. The others cannot believe, because the power is not in nature and it does not please God to bestow it by grace. The divine purpose to work faith is limited to the few who alone are elected unto faith. In these that purpose is effected, and no power can hinder it. They *must* believe unto salvation; the rest *must* remain in unbelief or fall away and die in unbelief. This does not necessarily imply that the elect are converted by violence. Neither the old Calvinists nor the new Missourians maintain this. Both admit that God does not force faith upon the souls of the elect against their will. Both teach that He so acts upon the will of those whom He designs to convert that it cannot resist, because the power of the Spirit

is a cause that prevents resistance. In the doctrine of both it is a necessary assumption that the power of grace is irresistible. The Missourians have not, indeed, adopted this term. But so far as we are able to see they accept that which the Calvinists express by it and which it properly designates. While neither admit that there is in any case a compulsory conversion, because by such a conversion they understand a change in which the subject's stubborn resistance is crushed by violence, both maintain that it is impossible to prevent the execution of God's purpose to convert the elect, and that the subject can therefore do nothing by which the operation of the Holy Ghost in the soul could be frustrated. The elect *must* believe. That God has resolved upon, and no resistance, natural or otherwise, can or could hinder it. The theory assumes that in such persons there is no wilful resistance that must be overpowered by force, but that is simply because in them the grace of God is irresistible according to the divine purpose, and therefore no resistance that would necessitate violent measures is permitted to arise. All opposition in the elect is made impossible by the divine decree, and therefore resistance in them is impossible as it is in a stone. As Dr. Walther expresses it, "they shall and must be saved."

If this meant simply that man by his natural powers can do nothing whatever to change his nature and effect his conversion, and that such change must therefore be made by an operation of the Holy Ghost that in its incipient effects is inevitable, there would be no good ground of objection. The mind cannot, from natural sources, have any knowledge of spiritual things, and it cannot by natural powers have any motions towards them. Something must be done from without to bring them before the soul and to lead the soul to entertain them. That is precisely what the Gospel does. It reveals the righteousness of God and it is the power of God unto salvation. There is certainly an analogy between the process of bringing spiritual things and that of bringing temporal things to our cognition and acceptance. We never could know things subject to our senses if they were not brought before us, and the first steps in cognizing them are always inevitable. The starry heavens must be seen when we are out on a clear night. The first emotions are equally

inevitable. We must admire the grandeur of the starry heavens when the eye perceives them. But we can close our eyes or turn away from the glorious scene, and we can refuse to entertain the thoughts or emotions which are started by observing it. The effect is not irresistible. So the Word of God, when it is heard or read, must produce some effect upon the soul. There never could be faith in it, and there could just as little be a revulsion of the feelings against it, if its contents were not first brought to the intelligence. If those who take the position that man's passivity in conversion implies the inevitableness of all the results of grace in the human soul, merely design to affirm that the Gospel introduces light and with it some emotions even before the will can take any active steps with regard to it, we have no controversy with them. That is unquestionably true. But that would decide nothing, and that is not their meaning. They do not, as we understand them, mean to say that every person who hears the Gospel and who is thus inevitably affected by its influence, is to be regarded as converted. At least the Calvinists of the old shool expressly maintain that this result is attained only in the elect; and the Missourians, although they inconsistently admit that a non-elect person may be converted and therefore that a converted person may fall from grace and be finally lost, still have never admitted that every hearer of the Gospel was at the time he heard it a believer, though it may have been but for a moment. Holding the Calvinistic error that God has from eternity determined by an absolute election which persons among the many lost should be made believers in Christ and be brought to salvation through His name, they hold also that only in those is there such an inevitability of grace in producing conversion. They admit, in other words, that there is a resistance, which hinders the work of the Holy Ghost, so that conversion does not result. While there is confessedly an inevitable operation of the Holy Ghost in all men who employ the means of grace by which He ordinarily works, they teach that there is, in addition to this, an operation which is confined to the elect, and in these something is inevitably wrought which is not wrought in the others who are not predestinated to faith and salvation. Manifestly they mean that there is not only an

inevitable grace for all men who hear the Gospel, but also an irresistible grace for those who are predestinated to faith and salvation and who therefore shall and must be converted and saved. There is no choice in the matter, neither for the elect nor for the non-elect.

This theory explains the difficulty presented by the question, How does it come that, although God is merciful to all alike and all are helpless alike, only some men are saved? It cuts the knot by denying that God is merciful to all alike, and imputing to Him a partiality and respect of persons in accordance with which He formed the eternal purpose to save a chosen few while He formed no such purpose in regard to the rest. The words of the Holy Spirit, "He will have mercy on whom He will have mercy" are construed to mean, not that he will execute mercy according to His revealed plan of salvation by faith in His only begotten Son, but that He will bestow mercy arbitrarily on whom He pleases and refuse to show mercy just when and where His respect of persons may dictate. It is thus made plain why some are saved and others are not: God chooses to save some and does not choose to save others. But whilst thus everything becomes clear at one point, everything becomes dark and dreary at another. "That is an ungodly opinion," says Luther; "for how would it be possible, if any one thought and believed thus of God, that He should otherwise than hate Him, whose will alone is the fault that not all are saved." (*Werke, Erl. Ed.* 2, 86.) Such a theory sets at naught the express declarations of God Himself, that He "will have all men to be saved and to come unto the knowledge of the truth," 1 Tim. 2, 4, and the Savior's own explanation of the sad fact that so many remain unsaved notwithstanding all: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets and stonest them that are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, *and ye would not.*" Matt. 23, 37. The theory sins against the truth concerning God and man, and makes the human will a mere machine without the power essential to the conception of will, without a voice in deciding the individual's destiny, and therefore without any responsibility or guilt, and yet dooms the majority of our race to endless torment.

II. But if this theory be rejected there remains, according to the estimation of many, only the other doctrine that man determines his own destiny in time and in eternity. This too has been advocated in many forms from the coarse naturalism of the school of Pelagius to the subtle compromises of the school of Arminius. But this too is a false theory, ignoring the depth of human depravity and the necessity of grace, as the other ignores the nature of God and man.

There were those in the early Church who maintained that man not only has the power by his original creation, but that, notwithstanding the fall, he has the power still, to choose between good and evil and to secure his own eternal salvation, if he only uses the power which is subject to his own will. There have been such men through all the ages down to our own day, and our present literature is full of the fond conceit that glorifies man, but does not glorify his Maker and Redeemer. The subject was one of the chief topics of debate and protest in the days of the great Reformation, and the references to it are therefore frequent in our symbolical books. Our churches, says the Augsburg Confession, "condemn the Pelagians and others who deny this original fault to be sin indeed, and who, so as to lessen the glory of the merits and benefits of Christ, argue that a man may, by the strength of his own reason, be justified before God." Art. 2. Again it says: "They condemn the Pelagians and others, who teach that by the powers of nature alone, without the Spirit of God, we are able to love God above all things; also to perform the commandments of God, as touching the substance of our actions. For although nature be able, in some sort, to do the external works, (for it is able to withhold the hands from theft and murder), yet it cannot work the inward emotions, such as the fear of God, trust in God, chastity, patience, and such like." Art. 18. The notion that man's will has the power, notwithstanding the entrance of sin into the world, to work righteousness, fails to make account of the deadly nature of sin and of the need of divine grace and the atoning merits of the Son of God. Therefore our Confession says: "It is false that we merit the remission of sins by our works. False also is this, that men are accounted righteous before God because of the righteousness of reason. False also

is this, that reason by its own strength, is able to love God above all things and to fulfill God's law, viz. truly to fear God, to be truly confident that God hears prayer, to be willing to obey God in death and other dispensations of God, not to covet what belongs to others, etc.; although reason can work civil works. False also and dishonoring Christ is this, that there are men who do not sin, but without grace fulfill the commandments of God. We have testimonies for this our belief not only from the Scriptures, but also from the Fathers. For, in opposition to the Pelagians, Augustine contends at great length that grace is not given because of our merits. And, in *De Natura et Gratia*, he says: "If natural ability, through the free will, suffice both for learning to know how one ought to live and for living aright, then Christ has died in vain, then the offense of the cross is made void. Why may I not also here exclaim? yea, I will exclaim, and with Christian grief will chide them: 'Christ has become of no effect to you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace.' (Gal. 5, 4; cf. 2, 21.) 'For they being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God. For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth.' (Rom. 10, 3. 4.) And John 3, 36: 'If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed.' Therefore by reason we cannot be freed from sins and merit the remission of sins. And in John 3, 5 it is written: 'Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' But it is necessary to be born again of the Holy Ghost; the righteousness of reason does not justify us before God and does not fulfill the law, Rom. 3, 23: 'All have come short of the glory of God,' i. e. are destitute of the wisdom and righteousness of God, which acknowledges and glorifies God. Likewise Rom. 8, 7. 8: 'The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God.' These testimonies are so manifest that, to use the words of Augustine, which he employed in this case, they do not need an acute understanding, but only an attentive hearer. If the carnal mind is enmity against God, the flesh certainly does not love God; if it cannot be subject to the law of God, it

cannot love God. If the carnal mind is enmity against God, the flesh sins even when we do external civil works. If it cannot be subject to the law of God, it certainly sins even when, according to human judgment, it possesses deeds that are excellent and worthy of praise." *Apol.* II. Art. 4, § 25-33.

The Pelagian theory, like the predestinarian, misrepresents both God and man, but does this in a different way. It ascribes too much to man and too little to God. It depreciates both sin and grace. It regards sin as an evil so slight that man can easily overcome it, requiring nothing more to this end than an exertion of the powers remaining after the fall. It regards grace as a gift so far indispensable that man can secure salvation without it. It glorifies man and dishonors the Son of God who came to save him. It ascribes to the human will in its natural condition what, according to the Scriptures, belongs only to divine grace. Therefore our Confession says: "The 18. article, of Free Will, the adversaries receive, although they add some testimonies not at all adapted to this case. They also add a declaration that neither with the Pelagians is so much to be granted to the free will, nor with the Manicheans is all freedom to be denied it. Very well; but what difference is there between the Pelagians and our adversaries, since both hold that, without the Holy Ghost, man can love God and perform God's commandments with respect to the substance of the acts, and can merit grace and justification by works which reason performs itself without the Holy Ghost? How many absurdities follow from these Pelagian opinions, which are taught with great authority in the schools! These Augustine, following Paul, refutes with great emphasis, whose judgment we have recounted above in the article of Justification. Nor indeed do we deny liberty to the human will. The human will has liberty in the choice of works and things which reason comprehends by itself. It can to a certain extent render civil righteousness or the righteousness of works; it can speak of God, offer to God a certain service in outward works, obey magistrates, parents; by a choice in outward works it can restrain the hands from murder, from adultery, from theft. Since there is left in human nature reason and judgment concerning objects subjected to the senses, choice between

these things, and the liberty and power to render civil righteousness, are also left. The Scripture calls that righteousness of the flesh which the carnal nature, i. e. reason by itself without the power of the Holy Ghost, renders. Although the power of concupiscence is such that men more frequently obey evil dispositions than sound judgment. And the devil, who is efficacious in the godless, as Paul says (Eph. 2, 2), does not cease to invite this feeble nature to various offenses. These are the reasons why even civil righteousness is rare among men, as we see that not even the philosophers themselves, who seem to have aspired after this righteousness, attained it. But it is false that the man does not sin, who performs the works of the commandments without grace."

Apology VIII. Art. 19, § 67-71. It is a mere delusion when it is supposed that, because man in his natural condition can will and perform external works which the law prescribes, he possesses the power to fulfill the divine commandments, and is therefore not dead in trespasses and sins and not a child of wrath by nature. He is a slave of sin notwithstanding, and only the truth can make him free; for his civil righteousness is only an external mimicry of the good, while his heart is only evil continually.

Only when men allow themselves to be deceived by appearances can Pelagianism seem to have any ground in human consciousness and human experience. When they look beneath the surface they perceive that, good as the works may seem, the spring from which they flow is evil and that man is sinful notwithstanding the righteous coloring put upon his performances. Pelagianism can flourish only in company with self-deception. The human conscience is a witness that our nature is sinful, and its testimony becomes more clear and more terrific the more the truth shines in upon the soul. And that which the conscience even in man's natural state urges upon our notice, the Scriptures state in terms so plain and perspicuous, that only the fact concerning which they testify renders it intelligible how men can fail to apprehend the testimony. The understanding is darkened as the will is enslaved; therefore the voice of God in the Scriptures is not understood. But that voice is none the less clear and distinct on that account. It tells us plainly that "God

saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually," Gen. 6, 5; that ye "were dead in trespasses and sins, wherein in times past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience, among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind, and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others," Eph. 2, 1-3; that without Christ we can do nothing. John 15, 5; that "by grace are ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any man should boast," Eph. 2, 8. 9. Neither in the nature of man nor in the revelation of God does Pelagianism find any support. It is a false theory devised by blind reason to exalt man at the expense of the grace and merits of our Lord Jesus Christ. Therefore "in opposition to the old and the new Pelagians the following false opinions and dogmas are censured and rejected; namely, 1. That original sin is only a *reatus* or debt, on account of what has been committed by another, without any corruption of our nature; 2. Also that sinful, evil lusts are not sins, but conditions, or concreated and essential properties of the nature; 3. Or as though the above mentioned defect and evil were not before God properly and truly sin, on account of which man without Christ must be a child of wrath and damnation, and also be beneath the power and in the kingdom of Satan. 4. The following Pelagian errors and the like are also censured and rejected; namely, that nature, ever since the fall, is incorrupt, and that especially with respect to spiritual things it is entirely good and pure, and *in naturalibus*, i. e. in its natural powers, it is perfect; 5. Or that original sin is only external, a slight, insignificant spot sprinkled or stain dashed upon the nature of man, or *corruptio tantum accidentium aut qualitatum*, i. e. a corruption only of some accidental things, along with and beneath which the nature, nevertheless, possesses and retains its integrity and power even in spiritual things; 6. Or that original sin is not a despoliation or deficiency, but only an external impediment to these spiritual good powers, as when a magnet is smeared with garlic juice, whereby its natural power is not removed,

but only impeded; or that this stain can be easily washed away, as a spot from the face or pigment from the wall." *Form. Conc. II.* Art. 1, § 17-22. All these errors are based upon a totally false corruption of the human will in its natural state, presupposing the possession of moral powers which were lost by the fall of Adam.

Nor has the modified form of Pelagianism which is usually called Semipelagianism, any foundation in the Holy Scripture or in the consciousness of man. It is the same error with a few concessions. While Pelagianism pure and simple maintains that man renders himself righteous and secures eternal life by his own powers of nature, the modified form claims that man can begin the work, but admits that he has not sufficient strength to complete it. "We reject the gross error of the Pelagians, who taught that man by his own powers, without the grace of the Holy Ghost, can turn himself to God, believe the Gospel, be obedient in heart to God's law, and thus merit the forgiveness of sins and eternal life. We reject also the error of the Semipelagians, who teach that man, by his own powers, can make a beginning of his conversion, but without the grace of the Holy Ghost cannot complete it." *Form. Conc. I.* Art. 2, § 9. 10. This is the system which was in vogue in the Roman Catholic Church in the days of the Reformation, and against which the Church of the Augsburg Confession contended then and still contends. "Although the adversaries, not to pass by Christ altogether, require a knowledge of the history concerning Christ, and ascribe to Him that He has merited for us that a habit be given, or, as they say, *prima gratia*, first grace, which they understand as a habit inclining us the more readily to love God; yet what they ascribe to this habit is of little importance, because they imagine that the acts of will are of the same kind before and after this habit. They imagine that the will can love God, but nevertheless this habit stimulates it to do the same more cheerfully. And they bid us first merit this habit by preceding merits, then they bid us merit by the works of the law an increase of this habit, and life eternal. Thus they bury Christ, so that men may not avail themselves of Him as a Mediator, and believe that for His sake they freely receive remission of sins and reconciliation,

but may dream that by their own fulfilment of the law they are accounted righteous before God; while, nevertheless, the law is never satisfied, and reason does nothing except certain civil works, and in the meantime neither fears God nor truly believes that God cares for it. And although they speak of this habit, yet without the righteousness of faith neither the love of God in man can exist, nor can what the love of God is be understood. Their feigning a distinction between *meritum congeni* and *meritum condigni* (due and true, complete merit) is only an artifice whereby they may not openly appear to pelagianize. For if God necessarily gives grace for the *meritum congeni* (due merit), it is no longer *meritum congeni* but *meritum condigni* (a true duty and complete merit). After this habit of love they imagine that man can acquire merit *de condigno*. And yet they bid us doubt whether there be a habit present. How therefore do they know whether they acquire merit *de congeno* or *de condigno*? But this whole matter was fabricated by unconcerned men, who did not know how the remission of sins occurs, and how in the judgment of God and terrors of conscience terrors are driven away from us. Secure hypocrites always judge that they acquire merit *de condigno*, whether the habit be present or be not present, because men naturally trust in their own righteousness; but terrified consciences waver and hesitate, and then seek and accumulate other works in order to find rest. Such consciences never think that they acquire merit *de condigno*, and they rush into despair unless they hear, in addition to the doctrine of the law, the doctrine concerning the gratuitous remission of sins and the righteousness of faith. Thus some stories are told, that when the Barefooted Monks had in vain praised their order and good works to some good consciences in the hour of death, they at last had to be silent about their order and St. Franciscus and to say: 'Dear man, Christ has died for thee.' This revived and refreshed in trouble, and alone gave peace and comfort. Thus the adversaries teach nothing but the righteousness of reason, or certainty of the law, upon which they look just as the Jews upon the veiled face of Moses; and, in secure hypocrites who think that they satisfy the law, they excite presumption and empty confidence in works, and contempt of the grace of Christ. On the other hand, they drive timid consciences to

despair, which, laboring with doubt, never can find from experience what faith is and how it is efficacious, and so at last they utterly despair." Apology II. Art. 4, § 17-21. The Pelagian doctrine in all its forms conflicts with the whole Gospel of the grace of God in Christ, ignoring, on the other hand, the magnitude and misery of sin and the helplessness of the sinner and, on the other, the atoning merits of Jesus as the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world and brings help to the helpless.

It is noteworthy that the confessors in the days of the Reformation, when the whole subject of man's sin and God's grace was the chief point of contention and was so thoroughly ventilated, always laid stress first and chiefly on the work of our Savior and the glory of His great name, as this is constantly the point of view presented in the Scriptures. What man can do is always contemplated in its relation to what Christ has done to save sinners. He was "made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." Gal. 4, 4. 5. Without Him we are condemned and can do nothing; "neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Acts 4, 12. Whatever disparages His work must on that account be false. The doctrine of justification by faith in Him as the Savior of the world was always placed in the foreground. No doctrine could be scriptural that in any way conflicted with this great center of the Christian creed. Whilst the Reformed parties started out with the article of the sovereignty of God, bestowing grace where it seemed to Him good, the Lutheran, in the deep consciousness of human sin and helplessness, determined to know nothing but Christ and Him crucified for sinners, which necessarily involved the universality of grace and of the redemption, that there might be comfort for all sorrowing souls. "God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that He might have mercy on all." Rom. 11, 32. The Savior that was born and died for all men has provided for the preaching of the grace of God in Christ to all men. The good tidings of great joy were and are for all people. But they can be saved only by faith. "The Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the

promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe." Gal. 3, 22. So much account was made of faith as the essential prerequisite on man's part to the attainment of the salvation wrought out by our Savior, that the great reformer often spoke of it as if it were the one thing that rendered us acceptable to God. So the Church of the Augsburg Confession spoke and still speaks. For instance in the Apology it is said: "Whenever we speak of mercy it is to be so understood that faith is required, and it is this faith that makes the difference between those that are saved and those that are damned, between the worthy and the unworthy. For eternal life is promised to none but those who are reconciled in Christ. But faith reconciles and renders us just before God when and at what time we by faith apprehend the promise." *Art. III., Muell.* 144. So also the Scriptures speak, placing Christ and faith in Him in opposition to the sinner and his works. Man has merited damnation. That is his due. He can merit nothing but that. Whatever he may do or not do, he is a sinner under condemnation. Christ alone can help him. Christ has come to help him. The blood of the Son of God was shed as a ransom for the sins of the world. That avails for all men. Those who reject Him can have no life and no hope. Those who receive Him are rescued from the damnation which they have merited. There is no merit of eternal life save the merit of Christ. He that believeth on Him shall be saved, not because such believing merits anything, but because by such faith the merit that has been secured by the Redeemer for all men, which is the only merit that exists under the sun, is appropriated to the believer. There can be no merit in human works, as these are the sinful deeds of a sinful soul. Pelagianism in all its forms substitutes man's work for Christ's work. It dishonors Christ and glorifies the sinner. That is its condemnation.

But when the work of redemption is finished and the call is extended to men that they should come, as all things are now ready, there is no health and strength in men to comply with the call. Not only can they merit nothing before God, but they cannot of their own natural power appropriate the merit that is prepared for them. When man by the abuse of his liberty has fallen into slavery, it requires a

mightier power than his own to deliver him. That he went voluntarily into servitude does not change the matter. That does not prove that it lies in the power of his will again to be free. Even in temporal relations the fact that a slave went voluntarily into bondage does not imply the power to escape from it at pleasure. Much less can this be assumed in spiritual things, where chains are thrown around the soul and a moral inability is the consequence of moral defection. The power to destroy does not involve the power to restore. Man remained man, indeed, and thus retained all the powers which belong essentially to man, when by the free exercise of his will, he chose the evil rather than the good, but he did not remain holy and did not retain the moral ability to will anything holy. If he still were able to will the good, he would not be evil, but would only do evil. But he is wicked, not only does wicked works. Therefore his restoration cannot take place by any power that remains in his nature. If aid is not afforded from without he must remain in his sin and misery—"dead in trespasses and sins."

Our help is alone in God, who is rich in mercy. "By grace are ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God." Eph. 2, 8. Nor does that mean only that a Savior is necessary to satisfy the demands of God's righteousness upon us, and that God mercifully sent such a Savior in the person of His own dear Son. That is unquestionably necessary, and that is unquestionably a work of love that transcends all thought. "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John 3, 16. "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins." 1 John 4, 10. "God commendeth His love toward us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us." Rom. 5, 8. But God does more than that for us. It is needful, in our ruined estate, that something more should be done for us in order to effect our salvation. "He that believeth shall be saved." This was part of God's plan from the beginning. The only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth, was given to the world "that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish."

But to believe in Him requires more than such power as still remains in the human will since the fall. We cannot by our own reason or strength believe in Jesus Christ or come to Him. "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God." 1 John 5, 1. Flesh and blood does not reveal this truth, and does not render it credible when God reveals it. Only when the divine power that regenerates the soul is exercised upon man, does he believe. "Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." John 3, 5. 6. Faith is the gift of God. According to the Scriptures, therefore, man can neither redeem himself nor by the power that remains in him by nature can he through faith appropriate the redemption which the Son of God has effected. That he accepts the Savior and is declared free from the curse of sin is a work of divine grace as well as that he is redeemed by the precious blood of the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world. "By grace are ye saved."

We can therefore as little find in Synergism a scriptural solution of the problem before us as in Pelagianism. If the doctrine that God by His absolute power saves whom He pleases and the doctrine that man by His natural power saves Himself are equally false, there seems to be no way of extrication from the difficulty but that of holding that the power of God and the power of man's nature combine as equal causes in the production of the effect. But it merely seems so. Our Confession rightly condemns it as an error "when it is taught that, although man by his free will before regeneration is too weak to make a beginning, and, by his own powers, to turn himself to God and in heart to be obedient unto God, yet if the Holy Ghost, by the preaching of the Word, have made a beginning and offered therein His grace, then the will of man, from its own natural powers, to a certain extent, although feebly, can add, help, and co-operate therewith, can qualify and prepare itself for grace, and embrace and accept it, and believe the Gospel." Form. Conc. I., chap. 2, § 11. Man by his own natural powers can do nothing in the domain of the spiritual. Whatever he can

do or does, whether it be preparation for accepting grace or the act itself of embracing Christ by faith, is done, not by any natural power, seeing that his powers are all corrupt and possess nothing but moral inability, but by the power of grace operating through the Gospel. This the Scriptures distinctly declare. They tell us that man is spiritually "dead in trespasses and in sins," Eph. 2, 1; that without Christ we can do nothing, John 15, 5; and that he is "the author and finisher of our faith." Heb. 12, 2. "God, who is rich in mercy, for the great love wherewith He loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ. By grace ye are saved." Eph. 2, 4. 5. Such a theory sets aside the teachings of Scripture concerning the corruption of man and the grace of God, and detracts from the Lord's glory as manifestly as does Calvinism and Pelagianism.

It is not true that we are compelled to accept the one or the other of these errors. The Holy Spirit by the Scriptures leads us into the truth, with which they all stand in conflict.

Man cannot deliver himself from the death into which sin has plunged him. God in His infinite mercy has sent His Son to effect such deliverance by offering Himself as a sacrifice for our sins. Man cannot by his own reason or strength believe in Jesus Christ our Lord or come to Him. God in His infinite mercy sends His Holy Spirit to accomplish this. But the Lord Jesus, in pursuance of the gracious will of God that all should be saved, died for all; and the Holy Spirit, in pursuance of the same merciful design, is offered to all in the Gospel, which our Lord commanded to be preached to every creature in all nations. There is no respect of persons with God. So far as He is concerned, all men are to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth. This is stated so clearly and so frequently in the Scriptures that no doctrine in conflict with it should for a moment be entertained by the followers of Christ. If the acceptance of this plain truth of revelation led to Synergism, we would be constrained to follow whithersoever it leads, knowing ourselves to be safe whilst heeding the voice of our good Shepherd, who leadeth us into green pastures and beside the still waters. But it does not lead to this error. We are not bound to accept either the error that God treats man like

a brute or that man can help himself.* We are bound to embrace the truth, which is neither Calvinism nor Synergism.

L.

SOME MISTAKES OF SCIENTISTS

BY REV. A. PFLUEGER.

II. EVOLUTION.

Henry Ward Beecher, who recently began to preach a series of sermons on Evolution which are involved in hopeless inconsistencies and contradictions, and are evolved, not from the Bible, but from his fertile, though erratic, brain, once remarked that he "would rather be the descendant of a monkey than of a mudhole." This criticism was intended to throw ridicule upon the Mosaic account of the creation of man and to compliment the Darwinian theory of development. It was, moreover, a placing of the materialistic notions of Darwin and Haeckel above the record of inspiration as contained in Genesis and in other parts of the Holy Scriptures; and no amount of apology can save it from the charge that it is of a piece with the rankest infidelity and blasphemy. But, like many other witty sayings, Mr. Beecher's statement will not bear a close examination. Turn the light of logic upon it, and you will find that his theory does not save him from the mudhole after all. To avoid the mudhole he stops at the monkey. But that is only a dodge and a makeshift. The nature of the case is such that he has no right to stop at the monkey. The logic which leads him to the monkey will lead him much farther, even to Darwin's ascidian, Haeckel's moneron and Huxley's cosmic vapor. He will have to trace his ancestry according to the following theory: "Born of electricity and albumen, the simple monad is the first living atom; the microscopic animalcules, the snail, the worm, the reptile, the fish, the bird, and the quadruped, all spring from its invisible loins. The human similitude at last appears in the character of the monkey; the monkey rises into the baboon; the baboon is exalted into the ourang-outang; and the chimpanzee, with a more human toe and shorter arms, gives birth to man." These are the words

of Darwin as quoted by Dr. Wainwright in *Scientific Sophisms*, page 204; and when "the Abraham of scientific men" speaks, Mr. Beecher will certainly not refuse to believe what is spoken. Hence in tracing his lineage back to the father and mother of all life, electricity and albumen, he will have to bow in reverence successively to the chimpanzee, the ourang outang, the baboon, the monkey, the bird, the fish, the reptile, the worm, the snail, the animalcule, and the monad. Before he is done with this genealogical work he will certainly find himself crawling, if not sticking fast, in a mudhole, his witicism to the contrary notwithstanding. How much nobler and how much more acceptable, even from the standpoint of reason, the account given by Moses of the origin of man: "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul!"

In order to learn what Evolution really is we must examine the definitions and descriptions of it which evolutionists themselves have given. To begin with "the Abraham of scientific men," Darwin says: "I believe that animals have descended from at most only four or five progenitors, and plants from an equal or less number. Analogy would lead me one step further, namely, to the belief that all animals and plants have descended from one prototype. But analogy may be a deceitful guide. Nevertheless all living things have much in common, Therefore I should infer from analogy that probably all the organic beings which have ever lived on this earth have descended from some one primordial form into which life was first breathed."

Herbert Spencer's definition is the following: "Evolution is a change from an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity, to a definite, coherent heterogeneity; through continuous differentiations and integrations."

Prof. Tyndall says: "The doctrine of Evolution derives man in his totality from the interaction of organism and environment through countless ages past."

Prof. Huxley has come to this conclusion: "But even leaving Mr. Darwin's views aside, the whole analogy of natural operations furnishes so complete and crushing an argument against the intervention of any but what are termed

secondary causes in the production of all the phenomena of the universe; that in view of the intimate relations between man and the rest of the living world; and between the forces exerted by the latter and all other forces, I can see no excuse for doubting that all are co-ordinated terms of nature's great progression, from the formless to the formed, from the inorganic to the organic, from blind force to conscious intellect and will."

James Sully in his article on Evolution in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, makes use of the following language: "The most general meaning of Evolution may be defined as follows: Evolution includes all theories respecting the origin and order of the world which regard the higher or more complete forms of existence as following and depending on the lower and simple forms, which represent the course of the world as a gradual transition from the indeterminate to the determinate, from the uniform to the varied, and which assume the cause of this process to be immanent in the world itself that is thus transformed."

From all these definitions it will be seen that Evolution does not acknowledge the necessity of a Creator of the universe, but assumes that the cause of all life is immanent in matter itself. Look at it as we may, and explain it as we may, the logical outcome of our examination is that Evolution, as taught by Darwin, Huxley, Tyndall, and Haeckel, is nothing but bald materialism. It is therefore a shame that so many persons claiming to be Christians accept Evolution as an established doctrine respecting the origin of the various forms of life now existing upon the earth.

When we come to examine the doctrine of Evolution more closely, however, we find that those who believe it are by no means agreed in many important respects and particulars, and that they are really involved in fatal contradictions. Their agreement consists only in a common rejection of the Bible account of the creation, and in the belief that the higher forms of life have sprung from the lower ones. Otherwise they are not agreed. While one of them firmly believes in spontaneous generation, another of them just as decidedly rejects it; while one thinks that our most ancient ancestor was an ascidian, another thinks that the honor belongs to the

moneron; while one asserts that he has found certain hitherto missing links, another just as astutely claims that those links have not been found.

In his "Lay Sermons" Prof. Huxley says that "the improver of natural knowledge absolutely refuses to acknowledge authority as such. For him, scepticism is the highest of duties, blind faith the one unpardonable sin. The man of science has learned to believe in justification, not by faith, but by verification." And Prof. Tyndall says: "Without verification a theoretic conception is a mere figment of the intellect." "If scientific men were not accustomed to demand verification . . . their science, instead of being, as it is, a fortress of adamant, would be a house of clay." Now we agree that scientific theories need to be verified by indisputable facts, if they are to be regarded as science in the true sense of the word. What facts, then, do evolutionists furnish to prove that man has descended from the monkey, as his less remote, or from the ascidian or the moneron, as his most remote, though more humble, progenitor? The answer to this question is that they have not as yet produced a single fact that can, by any fair construction, be looked upon as a proof of their theory. They have been very prolific of assertions, but very barren of evidence to prove their assertions. To assert is very easy, but to prove is often very difficult or impossible. In view of what the Bible says in regard to the origin of man, we would be certain that evolutionists will never be able to prove that he descended from the ape or from some still lower animal, even if there were not so many difficulties in the way as there are in the very constitution of nature around us. For us the Word of God has decided the whole question. But, of course, we do not expect those who do not believe the Bible to accept its account of the creation; and therefore we will have to meet them on their own ground, and endeavor to show that there is nothing in nature to warrant the theory of Evolution. When they set up the claim that life came into existence by spontaneous generation, as is done in plain and explicit terms by Haeckel, or that there has been a transmutation of species until man has been developed from the lower animals, we have a right to ask them for the facts by which that claim is substantiated. Thus far

the facts have not been furnished by which either spontaneous generation or the transmutation of species can be proved.

In respect to spontaneous generation Darwin says: "Your reviewer believes that certain lowly organized animals have been generated spontaneously—that is, without pre-existing parents—during each geological period in shiny ooze. A mass of mud with matter decaying and undergoing complex chemical changes is a fine hiding-place for obscurity of ideas. But let us face the problem boldly. He who believes that organic beings have been produced during each geological period from dead matter, must believe that the first being thus arose. There must have been a time when inorganic elements alone existed in our planet: let any assumptions be made, such as that the reeking atmosphere was charged with carbonic acid, nitrogenized compounds, phosphorus, etc. Now is there a fact, or a shadow of a fact, supporting the belief that these elements, without the presence of any organic compounds, and acted on only by known forces, could produce a living creature? At present, it is to us a result absolutely inconceivable."

Mr. Darwin is certainly right in his objections to the doctrine of spontaneous generation. The fact is that no man has ever found a single living creature that was spontaneously generated. It was formerly thought that maggots were spontaneously generated in meat, until it was discovered that they are hatched from eggs deposited by flies. Spontaneous generation is "therefore a mere figment of the intellect" of certain evolutionists; and so long as they cannot point to a single instance in which a living thing was spontaneously produced—and up to this hour they have not been able to point to such an instance—we are justified in calling spontaneous generation a myth, and in passing it by as unworthy of any further attention.

But what shall we say of the transmutation of species? We must say that there is no more proof that man has been evolved by such transmutation from a monkey than that he was spontaneously generated. It is not claimed that any one ever witnessed a case in which an ape or a monkey was changed or transmuted into a man. The history of science

in all ages fails to furnish such a case or anything even remotely resembling it. Nor is there any evidence whatever in the paleontological remains which have thus far been discovered of any species having been transmuted into another. It is claimed, of course, that the transmutation took place gradually; and if the theory were correct, or were at all capable of proof, the fossils of the earth would have to show the different forms which any particular species successively assumed while it was changing into another. The only possible proof which can finally be relied upon by the evolutionist to support his theory must be sought in the fossils found in the bowels of the earth. But thus far fossils have been searched, examined and appealed to in vain to prove that man sprang from the monkey, and the monkey from the ascidian. The so-called chain which is said to unite man to the ascidian lacks as many links to complete it as there are species between those widely separated creatures. To such a chain a rope of sand is the very embodiment of strength and stability. Yet it is upon this chain that the theory of evolution depends. It is therefore no wonder that Darwin and other evolutionists have been obliged to admit that they have not found the missing link between one species and another, and have been led to deplore "the extreme imperfection of the geological record." Thus Prof. Huxley writes: "Our acceptance of the Darwinian hypothesis must be provisional so long as one link in the chain of evidence is wanting; and so long as all the animals and plants certainly produced by selective breeding from a common stock are fertile with one another, that link will be wanting." Darwin's own words are: "Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely graduated organic chain; and this, perhaps, is the most obvious and gravest objection which can be urged against my theory. The explanation lies, as I believe, in the extreme imperfection of the geological record." This "imperfection," however, was an afterthought; for he continues: "I do not pretend that I should ever have suspected how poor a record of the imitations of life the best preserved geological section presented, had not the difficulty of our not discovering innumerable transitional links between the species which appeared at the commencement and close of each formation, pressed so hardly on my theory."

"On a general survey of the theory," says Dr. Elam, "nothing strikes us more forcibly than the total absence of direct evidence of any one of the steps. No one professes to have ever seen a variety (producing fertile offspring with other varieties) become a species (producing no offspring, or no fertile offspring, with the original stock). No one knows of any living or any extinct species having given origin to any other, at once or gradually. Not one instance is adduced of any variety having ever arisen which did actually give its possessor, individually, any advantage in the struggle for life. Not one instance is recorded of any given variety having been actually selected for preservation, whilst its allies became extinct. There is an abundance of semi-acute reasoning upon what might possibly have occurred, under conditions which seem never to have been fulfilled;" "but," as Dr. Wainwright correctly adds, "of direct and positive testimony, whether derived from the experience of mankind or from the geological record, there is no fragment whatever."

Now what dependence is to be placed upon a doctrine which has not a particle of evidence to support it? Yet it is just such a doctrine that we are asked to accept as correct and true, although the acceptance of it involves the utter rejection of the Word of God. For Evolution, as taught by Darwin and Haeckel and kindred scientists—the only kind of evolution with which we here have to deal—and the Bible cannot both be right; albeit many suppose that the two can be shown to agree. In a majority of the efforts which are put forth to bring about such an agreement, Evolution usually plays the part of the lion, whilst the Bible is made to assume the part of the lamb, and the agreement comes in when the lamb has been swallowed.

But not only does Evolution lack all testimony to support it, so far as the experience of mankind and the records of geology are concerned; it also is confronted with insurmountable difficulties which have their root in the very nature of living things as we know them. Though it is an easy matter for the imagination to picture the transmutation of one species into another without a missing link, just as the ancients united man and the horse in the Centaur, woman and fish in the Mermaid, and man and the goat in the Satyr,

it is entirely a different matter when we come to think of the realization of such a transmutation in nature itself. The Centaur, the Mermaid, and the Satyr, have an existence in fable, but not in fact; and no intelligent man now expects that any such beings will ever be found either among living animals or among the remains of dead ones. In fact, however, it is just as reasonable to expect to find a real Centaur, as it is to expect to find the missing link between man and the monkey, but a frightful mongrel, just as the Centaur was neither a man nor a horse, but a combination of the two, which at present would be called a monstrosity.

Evolutionists claim that the evolution of man from the ascidian or the moneron took place gradually, ages intervening between any species and the one next above it; so that any organs or links which one species possesses and which those below it from which it was evolved, do not possess, must have existed for generations in a rudimentary and therefore a useless form. Thus the wings of a flying animal which was developed, by a slow and gradual process, from a wingless species, must at first have been only small stumps, and hence utterly useless so far as the mechanical act of flying was concerned, and certainly they were equally useless for any other purpose. Now what does experience teach us? Does it teach us that the arm or the leg which is not used develops into a strong, symmetrical and beautiful limb and is thus made all the more able to perform the functions for which it was intended? Does experience teach us that the eye that is not used, grows stronger and better able to see by such disuse? By no means. It teaches us just the reverse. The hand that is not used becomes at last unfit to use, because it loses its strength and its skill. The eye that is not used, instead of growing stronger, grows weaker, and finally becomes almost, if not entirely, unable to see. The eyeless fish in Mammoth Cave, Ken., are a striking example of the result of a disuse of the organs of sight. Being unable to use their eyes, even if they had any, in consequence of the intense darkness prevailing in the recesses of that wonder of the subterranean world, they have no need of those organs; and so it comes about that they have only the traces and marks of the eyes which their remote parents probably possessed. With these facts staring them

in the face, Evolutionists are certainly not in a position to claim that their doctrine has been established; on the contrary, they ought to see that their theory is untenable. Is it any wonder, then, that St. George Mivort should conclude his examination of Darwinism with the following words? "With regard to the conception as now put forward by Mr. Darwin, I cannot truly characterize it but by an epithet which I employ only with much reluctance. I weigh my words, and have present to my mind the many distinguished naturalists who have accepted the notion, and yet I cannot hesitate to call it a puerile hypothesis."

Finding no proof for their theory in human experience or in the records of geology, as they themselves confess, evolutionists have made the attempt to prove its correctness by means of certain facts furnished by embryology. On this point we will quote the words of Mr. Lawrence S. Benson, who has given the subject due attention. "The very great resemblance in the embryonic state of mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians and fishes is to the evolutionists a strong and convincing argument for the gradual evolution of higher organisms from the lower. They seize hold of this great resemblance to argue that all species have at one period of their existence no difference whatever, and they further argue that during the embryonic state, modifications of species are occasioned either by prolonged or accelerated parturition; and that during the prenatal existenece of species, the prevailing characteristics are transmitted, especially in domestication, in perceptible rather than imperceptible steps; and that as a rule, specific forms remain constant, which are, however, affected by food, temperature and other influencing conditions of existence, and these arguments they supplement by maintaining that the successive embryonic stages of higher organisms are the representative adult states of lower organisms, and therefore they claim that successive development is the result of extraordinary incidents of the process of derivation.

"Now if these evolutionists should be correct, why should there be monstrosity and hybridity? If the embryonic state of all organisms be identical, why should sterility result from the intercrossing of different species? To say that the variations among species have, by the continuous happening of

contrary circumstances, become so great and radical, that different species have lost their affinity, and consequently their offspring is abnormal, does not correspond with their argument which they build upon the great resemblance in the embryonic state of mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians and fishes.

"The fact of the possibility of monstrosity and hybridity refutes every argument that can be based upon identity in the embryonic state of organisms. The fact that monstrosity and hybridity are possible, shows *prima facie*, that in the embryonic state, organisms are not alike. This fact is so glaring that it needs no argument to support it. This fact is a stumbling block not only in the way of identity between the embryonic states of organisms, but it is a stumbling block in the way of the descent of species from pre-existing forms. When evolutionists show how the embryonic state of organisms can be alike, and monstrosity and hybridity be possible, then they will have removed an impediment which now clogs their theory. When evolutionists show how species have descended from pre-existing forms in the face of monstrosity and hybridity which result from the intercrossing of different species, then they will have established what they claim, that successive series of species are the result of extraordinary incidents of the process of derivation."—*Philosophic Reviews*.

The same author says, in his recently published work entitled *Philosophic Thought in all Ages*—a work which is worthy of being read by every minister and by our educated laymen—that "the doctrine of evolution must depend entirely upon the variations which result from the *intercrossing of species*; because *such* variations only can establish the mutation of species; and when these variations do occur, species in their unavoidable struggle for existence, according to this doctrine, seize upon them and perpetuate them. And it has been shown even by the admissions of Darwin and Huxley themselves, that breeds of the same stock or species are not sterile between one another; but that the intercrossing of breeds of different stocks or species produces sterility, hence, then, *sterility is the variation*, which must necessarily become seized upon and perpetuated; but if *this* variation becomes perpetuated by the law of natural selection agreeably to the doctrine of progressive development, then, through the direct action of sterility, we derive *extinction, not evolution*."

It seems to us that Mr. Benson's arguments are unanswerable. He carries the war into Africa, and defeats the evolutionists upon their own grounds. Driving their theory out of the fortress of embryology and over the precipice of the transmutation of species into the abyss of sterility to be dashed to pieces on the rock of extinction below, his victory is certainly complete.

We will close this article by quoting the following beautiful words of Dr. Krauth, found in the Introduction to his translation of "Ulrice's Review of Strauss":

"No men have such prophetic souls as sanguine physicists. The theorists sometimes ask no more than a boundless past to justify their theories, or not infrequently appeal, as if the gaze of the seer were granted them, to that happier future which is to furnish the missing links in the chain of demonstration. The sole reason that they cannot make out the theory of the present is, either that they cannot see quite far enough back into the past, or cannot see quite far enough into the future, except in the power of that theoretic faith which, disdaining such easy things as removing mountains, creates or uncreates universes at pleasure, and plays with nebulae as boys play with marbles. They utterly shame the believers in Revelation by the way in which *they* make faith the substance of things *hoped* for, and the evidence of things *not seen*.

"Darwinism has simply to get far enough back to reach the ape of the past, to see him in the way of evolution to the man of the present, or to plunge deeply enough into the ages to come, to see some man of the future evolved from an ape of the present—for we are primal to the future as the past is primal to us—and then the theory has a fact which fairly supports it—a something it does not possess to this hour. And as Darwinism needs but one of these two little things to make it an established theory, and as it has the boundless past to furnish the one, the endless future to furnish the other—why, in a matter which may require hunting to all eternity, should we attempt to hurry these trusting adherents, in the production of this fact? If they wish to meet the debts of science by renewing its notes, they have many mercantile precedents for the method which postpones the crash, even

when it does not prevent it. If the enthusiast in the physical theories of the hour is willing to promise the bear-skin before he has caught the bear, is not that a reason, in the judgment of charity, why we should pardon him if, in fact, he sometimes mistakes the promise of the skin for the actual possession of the bear, and that instead of considering the theory as a thing to be proven, he lays it down as a first principle by which everything known is to be explained, and in virtue of which everything desired is to be assumed?"

THE DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER IN MODERN THEOLOGY.

*Reviewed and criticized by Dr. F. A. Philippi; tr. from the
Kirchliche Glaubenslehre of the author by G. H. S.*

(CONTINUED.)

Essentially in harmony with Thomasius, are the views of Harnack, in his *Die Kirchl. Verwaltung des heil Abendmahls*, as the third in the series of discussions on the importance of the means of grace published by him in conjunction with v. Harsless. Erl. 1869. But he differs with Thomasius in this that he takes as starting point of his investigation the statement, that the *sacraments are the real church-forming and church-preserving means of grace*, cf. p. 154. For the sacraments are public acts of the Church and therefore stand in a closer relation to the Church. Cf. p. 115 sq. But Harnack also makes use of the distinction between person and nature in order to represent the sacraments as having an immediate influence on the psychico-physical side of our natural existence, cf. p. 177. According to his view the Word also brings and gives to us the whole Christ and puts us into a complete communion with Him, but always under the condition of personal faith; although it (the Word) exerts its power on the whole man unto the very depth of his unconscious spiritual life, it nevertheless appeals constantly to his consciousness, presupposes this, rouses it to action and works through it. In re-

gard to the Word, because it appeals to my personal, conscious being and life, the cardinal point is grace in so far as I actively must grasp it (grace), although the Word is not without effect also upon the natural basis of our person, cf. p. 186 sqq. Through baptism, however, by means of an act on God's part, of which we are made the objects without any action on our part and which takes place on our person alone, since in this action God takes hold of us from our psychophysical side through bodily means and influences the whole man, we are as individuals implanted into Christ and put into the relation of children, and though this be unto faith and for faith, yet it takes place without any reference to our conduct of faith. Through baptism I secure the objective certainty that God has received me also to be His child and heir, *not because I believe, but for the very purpose that I may believe this.* From this gracious act and power no baptized person can withdraw himself, however he may demean himself with regard to it, as little as a son can withdraw himself from being the child of certain parents. Hence, because I am a child of God, therefore I can and may believe, and therefore I do believe. Baptism as an act is the sign of a divine activity of grace, through which transpires that the baptized person, *having been implanted into Christ, at the same time can have himself as the object of his faith*, cf. p. 190 sqq.

Our objections to these views we have already mentioned in treating of the doctrine of baptism. But when Harnack, p. 195, thinks that only he, who is steeped in the unreasonableness or bigotry of subjective sin can in connection with this view speak of an *opus operatum* and who would then also have to deny the universality and sole efficacy of grace, I, for my part, in this case am perfectly willing to bear the charge of subjectivistic unreasonableness, but deny emphatically that therefore it will be necessary to reject the universality and sole efficacy of grace. Or is the effect of baptism which implants me into Christ, makes me a child and heir of God and thereby also an object of my own faith, not to be called a *saving effect*; even if this effect necessarily results irrespective of faith in the case of each one who becomes the recipient of the baptismal act, is this not rightly to be called a *saving effect ex opere operato?* When Harnack further, in

order to do justice to the accepted principle of the Church *idem effectus verbi et sacramentorum*, pp. 136, 140, 152, maintains an effect of the Word also down into the unconscious side of our spiritual life, and even upon the natural basis of our person, so that the Word works only through the person upon the nature, but baptism, on the other hand, through the nature upon the person, it is hard to see, why, when the effects are essentially identical, a person cannot be satisfied with the Church's doctrine of Baptism as the sealing of the Word. We indeed read on p. 188: "In this our nature, which is called "the flesh" in the Scriptures insofar as it is the old nature of our race, we have also the inexhaustible fountain of all those weaknesses, frailties and temptations of our life of faith. The renewal and sanctification of this our nature is therefore a *conditio sine qua non* of the health and growth of our faith." With this then the postulate of a sacrament that works immediately to transform the natural side of our being seems to be justified. But we must have recourse to the supposition that the sin which remains in the believer has its seat and source in his natural life, while in truth it has its root primarily in the personal life of the believer. Or is not unbelief the root of all sin, and does it with all its most direct fruits, such as self and workrighteousness, want of love and hope, not have its root in the self-conscious, personal life of man? And are not the severest and heaviest battles of faith just with unbelief and all its ramifications? It is in truth not the case that the higher spiritual and personal life of the believer is free from sin, and that sin is found only in the lower psychico-physical impulses of his natural life or luxuriates only in his unconscious spiritual life. Original sin proceeds from the unconscious natural ground into the personal life that is developed from this basis; while, on the other hand, the regenerating grace exerts its power constantly through the medium of the conscious personal life with a sanctifying effect on the spiritual and mental natural ground.

And if in the next place, the whole and complete saving effect is ascribed to the Word, why is it that those who, (as all should) receive it in faith, and thereby have been justified not only objectively but also subjectively have been incorporated into Christ and have become children and heirs of God, still stand in need of being

transferred objectively into the condition of saved beings through baptism? They have (according to such a view) already through the Word and through faith more than baptism can give them. Clearness and inner harmony we think, can be secured for this way of looking at matters only by denying to the Word the power of regeneration, justification and conversion, and by ascribing to it only a propaedeutic and paedagogical importance, which would be a depreciation of the Word against which Harnack also protests. But only in this way can we find a specific difference between the Word and Baptism. The Word would thus merely give preparatory information concerning the contents and the saving gifts of baptism, and would make man willing to become a partaker thereof; while baptism itself would implant the whole wealth of salvation into the natural ground of the person baptized, and while through the Word which always follows baptism he is ever reminded of this reception of grace and is encouraged to its subjective reception by faith, he now also, through the power given him in baptism, consciously and of his own free will receives the gracious gifts of baptism which had been implanted into his natural ground. Of course there is then really no need of any instruction through the Word preceding baptism, but we could take anybody who would be willing to submit to it as an outward action, and incorporate him into Christ and make him a child and heir of God and afterwards explain to him of what great gifts of grace he had become the recipient through this act. In this way it would prove to be true what Harnack says, that every baptism of an adult is in essence the same as the baptism of an infant.

For our purpose however the principal question is the relation of the Lord's Supper to Baptism according to Harnack's view. Here especially do we see the real and full bearing of the statement which he has put at the head of his treatment of the sacraments, namely that they are church-forming and church-preserving means of grace. We have, he says, in treating of the sacraments, to discard the one-sided view which takes into consideration the subject only, and must turn our attention to the social sphere of the Christian kingdom, i. e. to the economy of salvation itself and to

the congregation or Church of Christ. *The contrast of Word and Sacrament corresponds to that of individual believer and the congregation of believers to such an extent that the one completely covers the other.* The specific means through which the Lord exercises His church forming, preserving and completing activity are the two sacraments. The Word is that means of grace which brings about faith by directing itself to the independent self-conscious personality. The sacraments, however, are the church-forming and church-preserving means of grace, which are homogeneous to the nature of the individual personality in so far as this is part of the common genus, and further to the nature of the Church as the *body of Christ*, so that without them there would be no congregation of believers as the *somatic pleroma* of Christ. Cf. p. 145 f., 175.—Here we at once perceive the connection which the distinction between personal and natural life has with the doctrine of the sacraments as the church-forming and the church-preserving factors. For only in his natural state is man determined by the genus; but through the sacramental sanctification of the human natural ground a holy race or congregation is separated from the world and formed. What is true of the sacraments as a class is applicable to the Lord's Supper in particular. The Lord's Supper is the showing forth, the carrying out and nourishing of the communion, not of the individual Christian as such, but of the congregation with Christ as its head. It has been instituted chiefly to form, nourish and maintain the Church as the body of Christ. Cf. p. 126. It has been instituted as the *congregational* sacrament, i. e. as a sacrament forming and preserving the congregation. It is not for the individual Christian as such and in his isolation, but for the congregation of believers as such. It is for the purpose of effecting congregational existence and a spiritual co-operative union and growing together of the individual members in and with the Lord to become one body of the congregation. Cf. p. 164, 166, 177.—Here the question now arises, wherein Baptism and the Lord's Supper yet differ as to their effects, if they are both congregation forming and congregation preserving means of grace. To this, in the first place, the answer is given, that participation in the Lord's Supper is not an expression of a communion to be first given (through baptism) or to be renewed (through absolution), but that it

is a constant and renewed consummation of the communion already existing and which is to be more and more realized. Cf. p. 128. According to this it would appear to be more correct to say, that Baptism is the congregation forming, but the Lord's Supper the congregation preserving and congregation increasing means of grace, instead of ascribing to both the purpose of forming, preserving and increasing. And we are not brought beyond this when we read on p. 198, that the Lord's Supper draws the believer deeper and firmer into the real communion with Christ and His body, and that for his personal life of faith it secures in his natural life a basis homogeneous to the former and strengthens it. Still more precisely is the relation between Baptism and the Lord's Supper defined on p. 214, according to which Baptism is that means of grace through which the Lord creates and preserves this His Church in the world, in so far as this Church is extensively and intensively in the process of coming into existence and of being constantly sifted and purified, the *ecclesia late sic dicta*; while the Lord's Supper constantly puts the existing congregation on a firmer basis, nourishes it and develops it toward its perfection, in so far as it has relatively become such a Church by virtue of Baptism and the Word, namely, the *congregation of believers*, the *ecclesia stricte sic dicta*; and as such, indeed, being also itself in the stage of growth and increase, or the militant Church of Christ in the form of a servant. Cf. also p. 195, 203. If by this is meant, that Baptism forms and increases the body of Christ in so far as this is the congregation of *all* the baptized, but that the Lord's Supper forms and increases the body of Christ as the congregation of the *believers*, then indeed both these sacraments could be said to have in an equal degree the church-forming and church-preserving power, the one in the outward, the other in the inward sense of the word. However in this case it is impossible to understand how the Lord's Supper can *form* the congregation of believers, since also according to Harnack a beneficial reception already presupposes faith and it is the sacrament intended for the congregation of believers only. And in truth he says only that the Lord's Supper constantly puts upon a firmer basis the congregation as *already existing*, nourishes it and develops it

toward perfection in so far as it has relatively become the congregation of believers through Baptism and *the Word*. Then we must conclude that Baptism is the sacrament that founds and forms the congregation, and the Lord's Supper the sacrament that only preserves and prospers the congregation. Faith is worked neither by Baptism nor by the Lord's Supper in themselves, but by the Word alone. Baptism creates the holy natural ground and accordingly that which may be called the objective body of Christ for the object of the subjective reception of this act of grace through faith in the Word; the Lord's Supper nourishes and preserves this holy natural ground, but not *for* faith, but only *in* the believer who has become not merely objectively but also subjectively the body of Christ, while in the unbeliever (cf. p. 199) it has not these beneficial but only judicial consequences, even such as destroy the bodily life. But in all cases the effect of the two sacraments in themselves and in an immediate manner is diverted in an equal degree to the natural ground, sanctifying, purifying, transforming, glorifying it, and no specific difference between their effects can be discovered, except possibly this one, which, as we have already remarked, is altogether without foundation, namely that Baptism is unconditionally but the Lord's Supper conditionally beneficial, and under certain conditions has a destructive effect upon the natural life of man.

Be this as it may; with these so-called effects of the sacraments upon the nature of man, there fall to the ground also the church forming and church preserving effects which are so closely interwoven with the former, in Harnack's conception of the whole matter. At the bottom of this we find that conception of the church, according to which she is the body of Christ already as the congregation of baptized persons and not only as the congregation of believers, which idea we cannot consider as based upon the Scriptures or the Confessions, and of which we will speak further on in our treatment of the church. Even if in the objectivity of the views we do not go so far as to say that "Men are and come into existence only because *mankind* is to be and is," (p. 168), or to speak of the church as the body of Christ, on whose account the individual believers, and even all mankind, exist, and without which

there would be no believers at all (p. 171), it is therefore not yet a necessary conclusion that we are governed by the atomistic and subjectivistic way of thinking found among believers of our day, who, in the plan of the divinely established *congregation* (*Gemeinde*), put the *communion* (*Gemeinschaft*) which has been established and nourished by the believers as a free relation of individual to undividual, and which mixes the Church, which is also but in a secondary manner the product of the faithful, with her in her capacity as an objective creation of grace, cf. page 166. I am of the opinion that the Lord and His Spirit in the Word and Sacrament are a sufficient objective bond of union of the church as the communion of believers, who find the basis of their oneness not in the sanctified natural ground of the species, but in the first instance in their common confession of the triune God and then through Him also in themselves. How great the danger is that in this conception of the church of which we here are speaking, the church usurps the place of Christ, or at least assumes some of His *vices**, appears to us to be clear from p. 179, where it is said that the believer, when partaking of the Lord's Supper, just through his membership is to be directed from his weak, tempted, and fluctuating faith, to the ever-abiding faith of the congregation or the church of Christ, whose faith is ever the same though it grow from strength to strength. Also from p. 221, where it is said that the Lord did not appoint the Supper for the individual and that it should not be taken by any one in his capacity of an individual; but that it had been instituted for the organized congregation, though in it, with it and through it also for the individual, in so far as he does not wish to be considered alone but acknowledges himself as a member of the congregation, and as such desires the saving gift and its strengthening help. I cannot see, why the objection, that in this manner the Lord's Supper is to a great extent deprived of its force for the individual Christian, is represented to be based solely upon a gross misunderstanding, or why in this doctrine of the Lord's Supper the atomistic subjectivism, the Corinthian separation, which is the evil of our day, is no longer possible, cf. p. 210. Forgiveness of sin, the gift of the Holy Ghost, communion with Christ,

[* Place and office. Ed.]

life and salvation for the individual through the Word and Sacrament ever and always remain the principal matter, the *communio sanctorum*, with all its comforts and blessings ever remains only a resulting matter, conditioned by no effect of the sacrament upon the natural ground of man. And therefore I cannot in conclusion admit, that it is a mark of superficiality in judgment or a great misunderstanding when we object to the views which we here oppose, that they make what our dogmaticians make the secondary purpose of the sacrament to be the first, and therefore do violence to the first purpose. Cf. p. 165. For even if the dogmatical term *finis secundarius* refers to that which the congregation and the recipient of the Lord's Supper in its reception confesses and proves, it is nevertheless true that also according to the teaching of our dogmaticians, that also which our Lord in His sacrament does and brings about, refers in a primary manner to the individual and in a secondary manner to the congregation, since He in the first place puts all the individuals into communion with Himself, and because He is the common connecting link of all, they are also thereby in an actual way united with each other. And just because the Holy Supper, although only in a secondary sense, is a sacrament that nourishes the congregational life, our Church wants it to be celebrated regularly as a congregational ceremony; and this suffices entirely to explain their practice which by no means justifies us in drawing extreme dogmatical conclusions. Otherwise we could probably with a better show of reason draw from this practice the conclusion, that the Lord's Supper is nothing more than a congregational act, as this is taught by the Reformed.

It has not been an easy matter for me to oppose my friend Harnack in this matter. It would have afforded me much pleasure, could I had agreed with him on this point. May the reader draw the conclusion from this, that it is not the object of my polemics to offend a person, but only according to my best knowledge, conscience and ability, to defend the truth.

CHRISTIANITY IS THE PARENT OF TRUE
ELOQUENCE.

BY REV. L. H. SCHUH.*

Fellow Alumni!

Heaven's highest gift to man is mind. It is the privilege of mind to exchange thought by means of language. Not all have the happy faculty of fluently and lucidly communicating thought. Unto the servant of the public, especially the leader or teacher, no gift will prove of greater advantage than that of eloquence by which the orator sways the multitude; riviting their attention; kindling in the bosom's core the fires of passion; melting them to tears by picturing in all its vividness some dread calamity impending over home and country and moving them to deeds of heroism and bravery; appalling them by pointing out the wreck by the road of ruin; entrancing them by the play of his imagination—thus by his gift of speech the orator “wields the living mass as though he were its soul.”

The strength of a discourse is conditioned primarily by its subject. No speaker can be eloquent upon a dog-fight, and the effort would be a burlesque; while no battle-scarred veteran can narrate in language never so homely, the heroic deeds of Washington or Napoleon without enlisting the attention and sympathy of his hearers. That difference of effect lies not so much in the man as in the subject; therefore that which offers the noblest themes for discussion opens the widest field for eloquence, and since Revelation offers these, *Christianity is the Parent of True Eloquence.*

The subjects upon which the Christian orator speaks are the profoundest ever offered to the human mind. What could be more grand or elevating than the thoughts the sacred Scriptures suggest of God, an infinite Spirit; a Being who was long before the mountains and hills were brought into existence, in whom there is neither variableness nor shadow of turning, and who will be long after the day-star has burned out in the heavens, and the earth has crumbled back into its former nothingness; a Being so powerful that by His Word

* Address to the Alumni Association of Capital University, and published by request.

He called all things into existance and now holds the universe in the hollow of His hand; who sits in the throne of the heavens and marks out the paths of the celestial bodies and directs the destinies of nations; a Being so wise that He knows all things in heaven, earth and hell; a God who is everywhere entirely and yet not limited by space, from whose presence we cannot fly; a God who is the paragon of perfection! What a theme for discussion, what a subject for eloquence!

What a theme for discourse, God's messengers, the angels! Job burst out when by inspiration he heard their songs on creation's morn, "When the morning stars sang together and all the sons of God shouted for joy." "Songs, aye! sung before the saphire colored throne to Him who sits thereon with solemn shout and saintly jubilee and the cherubic host in thousand choirs touched their immortal harps of golden wires."

The poet has said: "Man's greatest study is man." If so, there is no place to go to for the solution of his fearful and wonderful being than to revelation. Nothing so opens up the secrets of his composition, the depth of his depravity, or the sphere of his usefulness.

Add to these inexhaustible themes the mysterious incarnation of Jesus Christ; His miracles among men; His redemption of mankind; His agony in the garden, so bitter that it pressed great drops of bloody sweat from out His brow. Conceive if you can His torment when upon Calvary in the excruciating agony of His soul He cried out: "My God, my God why hast Thou forsaken me!" So bitter was the cup that the earth trembled in sympathy and the sun hid his face in darkness. Count in Christ's resurrection from the dead, His glorious ascent into heaven, His sitting at the right hand of God, and His coming in the clouds attended by all the heavenly host to judge the quick and the dead.

What could be more awful than the resurrection of all the dead! The arch-angel's trump will blast, and shake their mansions; the sea will seethe and surge and the incoming wave will wash up the forgotten and unknown. The earth will mourn like a woman in travail and the dead in her womb shall come forth. God's angels will sweep them together

upon the four winds of the heavens. They will separate the sheep from the goats. The Ancient of Days will break the seven seals upon the Book of Life. Men in the despair of suspense will cry out: "Mountains fall upon us, and hills cover us." The doomed will be hurled headlong into hell; the elect snatched up in the clouds will be wafted into glory.

And oh, the consummation! The stars will flash, and sway, and swing; they will fall with great trains of fire sweeping after them. The lamp of day will be extinguished, the moon will appear red like blood. The visible heavens will pass away with a deafening noise; the earth will be wrapped in flame and consumed with fire. And after that will open up eternity—the very word is terrifying—a boundless expanse—an endless duration—the mind strains to grasp the thought and sinks back overwhelmed by its massiveness, recognizing its own diminutiveness.

Sum up all those themes and tell us are they not the profoundest ever proposed to the human mind, and is there a limit to that field of eloquence! "Imaginations utmost stretch in wonder dies away."

To set forth a subject well one needs a lively imagination. It is this faculty of the mind which invents figures of speech and clothes subjects in ideal beauty. To beget such creatures the imagination must have the proper material to work upon. It gathers no new knowledge; it only elaborates and from given materials forms her creatures in the perfection of beauty. That which offers the best crude material therefore, gives the widest scope to the imagination. Where this field is may be seen by looking at the works of those who have excelled in the flights of their imagination. John Milton could find no theme which offered a more extensive sphere for his Pegasus than "Paradise Lost"; John Bunyan could satisfy himself and gratify half the world only by his "Pilgrim's Progress"; Klopstock could find no grander theme than "Der Messias"; Dante could pour out the blackness of darkness which sat upon his soul in nothing but his "Inferno"; Tasso sang to the world in his "Jerusalem Delivered". Handel imitated the music of heaven in his "Messiah" and "Israel in Egypt"; Mendelsohn caught strains of music floating from out the pearly gates and chained them

in his "St. Paul" and "Elijah". Hayden sang of "Creation". Leonard de Vinci immortalized his name by painting upon the cloister walls at Milan "The Last Supper"; Raphael expressed his highest ideal in "The Transfiguration"; Michael Angelo left the world "The Last Judgment". The most exquisite works of art in literature, music and painting have drawn their inspiration from the Bible. Then why should not the Christian orator surpass all others in the beauty of his style, the massiveness of his conception, and in the flights of his imagination.

Oratory aims at the soul. Its object is to instruct, to gratify, or to convince and move to duty. In this latter the Christian orator has the decided advantage. Nothing so effectually appeals to the conscience, nothing is such a motive power toward duty as those truths drawn from inspiration. There is a sense of right and wrong and a feeling of obligation born in man and when from without the same truths knock for entrance, which from within are clamoring to be heard, the force becomes irresistible. Conscience tells of punishment for transgression, and when revelation opens up the whole sphere showing the exacting justice of God upon those who do not seek His mercy, the poor victim writhes and groans in most excruciating pain. When Nathan, the prophet, went to David and said, "Thou art the man," David was like one struck dumb; when Jonah went to Nineveh and told her of the impending doom, the inhabitants put on sack-cloth and ashes; when Paul preached unto Felix of righteousness and temperance and judgment to come, Felix trembled and said: "Go to, when I have convenient season I will hear thee." The orators of the world show no such magical effect as this, because nothing save divine truth can awake the slumbering conscience. The only thing by which the will can be forced to act comes from within and of these forces none is stronger than an aroused conscience. If a speaker would achieve the greatest results in moving men to become better and to discharge their duty as citizens, parents and Christians he can do it only by bringing home to the conscience the powerful truths of Christianity.

The themes of the Bible involve our temporal and

eternal welfare and by this inspire an earnestness which is the essence of eloquence. If Pericles, as historians report, could shake the firmest resolutions of his hearers and set the passions of all Greece in a ferment when the welfare of his country or the fear of hostile invasions was the subject; what is to be expected from that orator who warns his audience against those evils which have no remedy when once undergone. Just as much more precious as the soul is than the body, just as much as the eternal surpasses the temporal, by so much has the Christian orator the advantage in the inspiration of earnestness, by which like the swelling flood he rushes upon his audience, drowns their prejudices and moves them to duty. St. Paul was so carried away by his earnestness that Festus said: "Paul, thou art beside thyself, much learning hath made thee mad." "I am not mad, most noble Festus, but speak forth the words of truth and of soberness." He who loves his race will find the earnestness with which he addresses men upon a temporal topic, fanned into a white-hot blaze, when he addresses them upon the highest welfare of an immortal soul.

The themes of Christianity are possessed of beauty and sublimity, the highest marks a subject may have for effective oratory. The sublime produces the profoundest effect; of this vastness is a mark. Where could you find a subject more vast than God, who is unlimited by space filling all things. What is longer than eternity, or as infinite as the hosts of heaven. Power awakens the feeling of the sublime. What is the power of ponderous machinery, or the monster locomotive shaking the earth beneath it, compared to Him who is all-powerful. What are earthquakes, thunder and lightning, volcanoes, storms at sea, in comparison to Him who has made the elements and subdues them. What are horses and lions but pygmies when compared to God's angels. Compare the awfulness of silence and solitude, of the hoary mountain and aged forest, of the deserted ruin, to the mysterious darkness with which Jehovah has surrounded Himself: "He bowed the heavens also and came down; and darkness was under His feet; He makes darkness His secret place, His pavillion round about Him were dark waters and thick clouds of the sky." What is more awful than the resurrec-

tion of all the dead, the judgment, the consummation, and hell. What is the deep bass of the ocean, and the peal of distant thunder, to the shouts of the redeemed and the voice of angel and arch-angel with uplifted trumpets filling heaven's high halls with music loud as the sound of many waters and mighty thunderings.

Color affords the simplest instance of beauty. How pleasing the white mantle of snow, the whiteness of the lily or of the swan; but what in comparison to the throngs of those clothed in garments washed white in the blood of the Lamb, standing in countless circles around the great white throne, looking upon him whose face when transfigured surpassed the brightness of the sun. There is beauty in the exactness of the works of man, but there is endless beauty in the variety of figure as these have come forth from the hands of the Creator. And if this world is simply the invisible made visible, and if here all things are the expression of a divine idea, how much more will things be surpassing in beauty of figure where God dwells visibly and where He has given shape to the highest ideals of His mind.

It is true that men without the light of the Bible do in a general way discourse upon these same themes, but what of their beauty or sublimity. Imagine Cicero the highest type of Roman oratory trying to move his hearers to duty by pointing them to their gods of stone or of brass, or even by referring them to Jupiter or the unknown Fate, and behold how the attributes of beauty and sublimity dwindle into insignificance!

Where is the vastness, or power, or awfulness in such an appeal. The wrath of these gods was shown by falling down at night when none was near: what in comparison to Him who in His wrath destroyed the world by water, who touches the mountains and they smoke and before whose anger the hills melt like wax. Jupiter was not considered infallible nor almighty, in fact, he was a man upon a large scale. Where is the sublimity of him whose head burst to give birth to an inferior deity, and at whose court intrigues and love affairs were the order of the day. The story of Vulcan cast out of the back door of Olympus and now forging thunderbolts under Mt. Aetna sinks into insignificance when compared to the

expulsion of Satan and his angels from heaven and their plunge into hell. Elysium and the Happy Hunting Ground of the North American Indian are clothed with rags when compared to the beauty surrounding the Christian's heaven. There is something in all these pagan ideas which appeals to the rational intuition, but to speak of arousing the feelings of beauty and sublimity—never; they are as the shadow compared to the substance.

History furnishes us with sufficient examples to make the bold assertion that Christianity has produced the greatest orators of the world. First among these and towering above all the rest is the Apostle Paul, the highest exponent of the Christian religion and the world's greatest orator. The men of those days bear ample testimony to the greatness of his powers. In a fragment of the writings of Longinus, still preserved in the Vatican library, that writer has summed up the greatest Greek orators and says: Add to these Paul of Tarsus, the patron of an opinion not yet fully proved." As a heathen he condemns the Christian religion, and as an impartial critic he judges in favor of the promoter and preacher of it. When Paul preached at Lystra the people said: The gods are come down to us in the likeness of men! and they called Paul Mercurius, because he was the chief speaker." Mercurius was the god of eloquence. So great was Paul's gift of speech and so mightily did it effect them that they thought him to be the god of eloquence personally come among them. Cicero and Demosthenes were never thought to be more than human, and no such compliment was ever paid to speaker ancient or modern. Agrippa was moved to say: "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian," and Felix trembling sent Paul away because the shafts of his eloquence were irresistible.

Next in time among the great orators of the church stands John Chrysostom. His name interpreted means John the golden mouth, conferred upon him by his times in recognition of his powers. So grand were his bursts of eloquence that when he had reached his climax, his congregation against his protest would join in loud applause. He was the recognized orator of his day.

Peter of Amiens, a meager-visaged pilgrim, returning

from a journey to Jerusalem, described the suffering of those eastern Christians to the Pope. The latter ordered Peter to journey through the land and prepare the minds of the people for the deliverance of Jerusalem. His passionate address and exhortation, "To deny oneself to take up the cross to win Christ," made before a vast assembly at Clermont in southern France, was followed by a deafening applause, "It is the will of God." The first crusade was formed and when on the plains near Nicæa a review was held there were 100,000 cavalry, 300,000 infantry all fit for battle, and in their ears still rang the words of Peter and drove them on to duty.

In the thirteenth century a Franciscan monk, Berthold of Regensburg, journeyed throughout Germany, lifting his voice against the sins of private life and the abuses of the Romish Church, and so great was the magnetism of his speech that he attracted audiences of from 50-200,000. He was Germany's greatest orator during all the Middle Ages.

Italy knows no greater speaker than the pre-reformer, Savanarola.

At the head of German orators stands our own inimitable Martin Luther. It was he who had fashioned the language and none knew better how to use its harsh gutterals and its sonorous vocables to their best advantage. Many have been the praises showered upon him by friend and foe, all concede to him the first place in his day.

France can never forget the enchantment of Bossuet and Massillon. England still echoes to the voice of Whitefield and never within the memory of man has London yielded an audience of 50,000 except to him.

These have been the model orators of their day and nation. They have headed the greatest movements in the history of the world and by their eloquence directed their course. And if the men of to-day desire to reach the highest plain of oratory they need not look beyond the fundamental truths of Christianity, and the orators it has produced. Christianity is the orator's, "Ne plus ultra!" the philosopher's stone turning whatsoever it touches into gold.

HOMILETICAL DEPARTMENT.

HOMILETICAL RULES.

From J. A. Quenstedt's "Ethica Pastoralis." Translated from the German by Rev. M. R. Walter.

V.

The sermon should be systematically arranged and the contents of the text dissected and orderly disposed.

"Without the disposition the sermon is a corpse," says Dr. Heinrich Mueller. *Orator Eccl. c. 3, § 1, p. 17.*) Carl Regius makes the timely remark (*Orat. Christ. I. VIII. c. 1*) "Just as a pile of building stone does not necessarily constitute a house, but must first be joined together in regular order; just so a collection of all kinds of material is no discourse, if there be no order and proper disposition of that which is collected." Masenius in his *Palaestra Orat. I. I. c. 15*, p. 84, says: "It is not enough that the general-in-chief be simply the leader of a large army, for if it be not divided into regiments, so as to be effective in forming into a line of battle, he will fight without victory."

Now the disposition is simply an orderly arrangement of the gathered material for the sermon, or an orderly disposing of the parts of the sermon. Or, as the definition given by Lic. Carpzov, in his appended "Monitis" to his father's work p. 65 says: "It is the suitable arrangement of the parts of the sermon and an harmonious division of the material drawn from the text of that which is to be said upon the subject, and of the gathered information."

The disposition is of the highest importance for the memory of both the preacher and the hearer. Cicero in his *Orat. L. II.* says that a discriminating disposition is of inestimable aid to the memory. "There is no greater evidence of knowledge and diligence than order," as G. J. Vossius

maintains. (Instit. Orat. P. I. l. 3, p. 321.) Order is necessary for the speaker so that he may not confound the topics of his sermon and become entirely confused himself. He who goes from the one extreme to the other by dividing into hundredths and thousandths likewise brings confusion upon himself. Order is of great value to the hearers as it enables them more readily to comprehend and retain what is said. All disconnected arguments are dark to the unlettered, odious to the learned and accomplished, and displeasing to God whose works, arranged in the most exact order, stand clearly before us. Here might be added the remark made by Christopher Luthhardt, *De Arte concion.* p. 56. "A good disposition is the torch of perspicuity, the light of perception, the mistress of brevity, and the life of memory."

St. Paul the greatest of masters in sermonizing admonishes Timothy in his second epistle (which Chrysostom called the Testament for the preparation for death) chap. 2, 15: "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." Dannhauer says rightly: "The way and manner in which we should preach lies in this: 'Rightly dividing the Word.' 'Rightly dividing' in 2 Tim. 2, 15 means not so much the arranging into chapters, paragraphs, and verses, but rather that the text be rightly treated. St. Paul here draws most keenly an illustration from the ancient custom of the symposiarch or governor of the feast, whose duty it was to divide the viands in an accurate and artistic manner. In a similar comment Gerhard remarks: "With the word (*ορθοτοπείν*) 'to divide rightly,' Timothy together with all other servants of the Church are admonished, to present the principal parts of the doctrine in a becoming manner, and observe a good method in disposing the biblical text, so that when we preach we do not separate that which should be united together, nor mix together that which should be kept separate. That which should be rightly divided is the Word of God."

"Rightly dividing the Word of Truth" implies that the theological material which is to be presented from the pulpit should be arranged in a systematic form and treated in a proper manner.

Furthermore, as already stated, a good substantial and logical disposition is an excellent aid to the memory. He who distinguishes well learns well. (Qui bene distinguit, bene docet.) Divide rightly and half of your labor is done, arrange your arguments properly and your work is nearly completed. With a partition of the material as a basis, the words and sentences will follow in order without much difficulty. An important assistant and guide to both speaker and hearer are order and disposition. Aristoteles says: "It is not the rule, that illiterate people write intelligibly." The highest commendation for an artist is the skillful arrangement of his work and material. Fonseca says in his *Instit. Log. 1. I. c. 4*: "There are two guides which lead to knowledge and understanding: definition and division (*definitio et divisio*).

According to Dr. Christ. Chemnitz the disposition for a sermon should be: 1. Textual, i. e. it should correspond with the text. 2. Adequate, i. e. it should embrace the whole text, but no foreign matter. 3. Harmonious, so that the whole be symmetrically connected, and that the order in the parts be logically consecutive. 4. Popular, i. e. within the grasp of the hearer's comprehension; and finally: 5. Concise, so that no disgust be awakened by too many divisions and subdivisions. Therefore, the pulpit orator should possess the following requisites: 1. He should be qualified for the invention of that of which he wishes to speak. 2. He should be able to make happy selections. 3. He should be able to assign to each individual idea or argument, drawn from the gathered and selected material, its respective position, just as an experienced field marshal arranges his soldiers in columns and files. 4. That he deliver his discourse according to its order and context.

It should be stated here that the preachers in the early Church very seldom used any disposition in their homilies, so the most of their sermons, although they have the character of a discourse, generally lacked order, hence, the most of them began their sermons without an introduction, spoke upon a theme without announcing it, and without any mention of the controverted point they set forth their arguments of refutation.

Generally, the sermon consists of five constituent parts: *Exordium, Narratio, Propositio, Confirmatio, and Peroratio*, i. e. the *Introduction, the Description, the Theme, the Demonstration and the Conclusion*, some add the *Confutatio*, or the *Refutation*. The application of the exordium is not always necessary, as we may branch out in the same direction farther on in the discourse.

The narration, in which a brief summary of the contents of the text, as it is to be presented in the discourse, is given, is very seldom employed, except in the description of texts which are to be historically treated. Generally the office of the narration is performed in the conclusion of the exordium, in which the introduction of the text is then complete, or in the introduction of the proposition itself with a brief presentation of the entire contents, either in a single statement, or else in a divided proposition. The refutation in which the arguments of the opponents are refuted, is not always necessary, inasmuch as the subject, and the matter under consideration, or the time and place, are not always such that it would be in place to present the refutation.

According to Huelsemann, Carpzov and others, the constituent parts of a sermon are: the introduction, the theme, the divisions, the discussion and the conclusion. The description and confutation are included in the discussion.

THE COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

This Magazine is designed to supply the want, long since felt, of a Lutheran periodical devoted to theological discussion. Its aim will be the exposition and defence of the doctrines of the Church as confessed in the Book of Concord. Theology in all its departments is embraced within its scope, though for the present special attention will be given to the controverted subject of predestination.

1. The Magazine is published bi-monthly, each number containing 64 pages.

2. The terms are \$2.00 per annum, payable in advance, which includes postage. Single numbers 35 cents.

3. All remittances should be addressed to J. L. Trauger, Agent, Columbus, O. All Communications pertaining to the Editorial Department to Prof. M. Loy, Columbus, O.

The friends of the Magazine are requested to give such aid in its circulation as their circumstances permit.

CONTENTS OF No. IV.

	PAGE.
1. THE WILL IN CONVERSION	193
2. SOME MISTAKES OF SCIENTISTS.....	225
3. THE DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER IN MODERN THEOLOGY...	236
4. CHRISTIANITY IS THE PARENT OF TRUE ELOQUENCE.....	245
5. HOMILETICAL DEPARTMENT	253

Monies Received for Volume V.

Rev. W. L. Busch, Greenville, Pa., Mr. H. J. Klingler, Butler, Pa., Rev. W. J. Schroyer, Hartford City, Ind., each 2.00, L. H. Lorenz, Springfield, O., 3.00, Rev. D. E. Snapp, St. Paul, O., 6.00, J. P. Weisman, Columbus, Ohio, 4.00.

C O L U M B U S

THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

A BI-MONTHLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF
THE EV. LUTHERAN CHURCH.

EDITED BY THE FACULTY OF CAPITAL UNIVERSITY.

VOL. V.—No. V.

O C T O B E R, 1885.

• • •

COLUMBUS, OHIO:
LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN OF THE OHIO SYNOD.
1885.

T H E
COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

VOL. V.

OCTOBER, 1885.

No. 5.

THE WILL IN CONVERSION.

II. THE TRUE DOCTRINE.

It has been shown that in the restoration of man from his ruined condition the Spirit of God uses no coercion. God saves the lost soul by His grace, but does not save it by the exercise of an irresistible power. Man may yet perish, notwithstanding all that has been done or may be done to rescue him. But it has been shown also that it does not lie in the power of man to save himself. He is spiritually dead, and cannot restore himself to life. Only the Spirit of God can do that. The subject thus presents itself as one of no little difficulty. God will not save men that are unwilling to be saved, and man cannot by any power that is in him by nature render himself willing.

But the difficulty is not insuperable. The case is not correctly presented when it is said that God will save no one by coercion, and otherwise no one can be saved. It is true that man cannot save himself and cannot render himself willing to be saved, and it is true that God alone can save but saves none that are unwilling. But it is not true that grace is equally powerless with nature to enable man to will the good. What man cannot do by his natural power he may do by the supernatural power offered through the means of grace. God does not force men into the kingdom of heaven; but when He calls them by the Gospel He enables them, by the power thus exerted, to heed the call and come to Him, although He does not by His power necessitate this. He works upon the soul by His grace, but that grace is not irresistible.

This is in accord with the nature of the will as we know it in consciousness as well as with the express declarations of Holy Scripture. The will is the power to choose and put forth volitions, and it cannot act at all unless it is permitted to choose. To say that, in any case where the soul is capable of conscious action and thus of any personal decision, the will has, without choosing it and deciding upon it, been brought to accept Christ and follow Him, is to talk nonsense. We cannot choose Christ when we have no choice.

This power of the human soul is not ignored by the Holy Spirit when He comes to man with offers of salvation. Indeed, it cannot be ignored without ignoring the creature that is to be saved. The sinner has a will, and he would not be converted to righteousness as long as his will chooses sin, neither could he otherwise than choose sin as long as he has not received power to choose righteousness. The Spirit therefore comes with power, not to coerce men, but to move their will. The Scriptures undeniably recognize the power of choice and appeal to it, although they just as undeniably teach that the right choice is never made by man's natural power. In Deut. 30, 19. we read: "I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing: therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live." Again in Joshua 24, 15. it is written: "If it seem evil unto you to serve the Lord, choose ye this day whom ye will serve, whether the gods which your fathers served that were on the other side of the flood, or the gods of the Amorites in whose land ye dwell; but as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord." So reasons and remonstrances are offered in abundance to induce men to make right decisions; for "how shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation." Heb. 2, 3. And so our Lord complains: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killst the prophets and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!" Matt. 23, 37. Whatever may be the opinions of men concerning the powers of nature and of grace it certainly is beyond all question that God recognizes the power of choice in the human soul and addresses Himself to it accordingly.

He never forces the soul; He never treats it as if it had no power of choice, and thus had become something essentially different from what He had made it; all His appeals to it are made on the presumption that it may reject His gracious offer; in all cases that is assumed as possible, which in some cases occurred in fact, and which is rebuked as utterly without excuse: "Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost: as your fathers did, so do ye." Acts 7, 51.

The will is moved by desires and affections which are ordinarily called motives. The judgment, whether directed by considerations of right or of expediency, acts only indirectly upon the will, placing things in such a light as to arouse desire or aversion, which move to action. But these motives are not physical causes which necessarily produce their effects. They influence in the direction to which they point, but they do not invariably result in corresponding action. Strong motives are often resisted and thus fail to produce the volition to which they prompt. The person, who has judgment as well as feeling, decides freely. He is not compelled to decide one way or the other. He may follow his judgment or may be led by his passion against his judgment. Why one decides thus and another otherwise, even when the same light is offered to both, may be explained partially by the difference in natural disposition and in training and habit, but in its main features is a mystery that we cannot hope to explain in the present life. Each man is a moral agent who is morally responsible, and his conduct is not to be explained by the assumed action of any necessitating forces which would relieve him of all responsibility.

While we most emphatically maintain that motives are not physical causes which necessarily produce volitions as their effects and therefore leave no room for choice, we do not deny that the Holy Spirit could act upon the soul otherwise than by motives and produce the desired results by the exercise of the almighty power which first called all creatures into being. And for such creative action there would seem to be some evidence in the words chosen by the Holy Spirit to describe the work of grace. The psalmist prays "Create in me a clean heart, O God," Ps. 51, 10; and the apostle says,

"If any man be in Christ he is a new creature." 2 Cor. 5, 17. But the fact that the first passage is a prayer should be sufficient to guard us against the misconception, that in conversion a new substance is created. In the nature of things we cannot desire what we know nothing about, and in our innate depravity we cannot desire a clean heart. The prayer for this therefore presupposes that the Holy Spirit has already been active in the soul, and that if the words cited imply the creation of a new substance, that new substance must have existed before the prayer for it could have been made, so that such prayer could be no proof of such meaning. And that fact should make us hesitate about assigning such a meaning to the word in other passages. The converted man is conscious of being the same man in essence that he was before, although he is conscious of having undergone a change in moral quality. That change is manifestly what is designed to be expressed by the figure of a new creation. Morally we become different persons by the influence of divine grace, and in this respect we are God's "workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works." Eph. 2, 10. The Holy Spirit addresses us as rational beings that can think and feel and will, and never by an exercise of almighty creative power makes a saint of the sinner, so that he who before only willed evil, now wills only good. That would in one respect remove all difficulties presented by the problem, but it would, as we have seen, do violence to the nature of man and contradict the Scripture teaching of the universality of grace; for if God saved men by His power, in spite of all that man can do, we know with absolute certainty that He would save all, because He has made known His will to save all. He undoubtedly has it in His power to create new faculties in man or to bring forth new creatures as substitutes for the corrupt beings whom He has condemned. But the question is not what He can do, but what He will do and what He does. The Scriptures teach that He would save sinners, so that the sinner saved retains his identity with the sinner condemned. To do this He comes with the power of grace to the soul, with a view of turning the straying sheep to their Shepherd. Hence gifts are imparted and appeals are made in order to effect the desired change. The power of grace is brought to

bear on the soul, bringing sufficient motives for a right decision, but not acting irresistibly and thus leaving no room for choice. What was the fact in regard to the people of Jerusalem is possible in all cases, "Ye would not." God supplies all the power for salvation, but man may resist it to his condemnation.

We have declared it to be sheer nonsense to talk of a soul, when it has once reached the years of discretion, as believing in Christ or coming to him without choosing it. That there is a work of the Holy Spirit in human hearts before consciousness has developed, and that through such work the soul may be saved, we not only do not doubt, but we earnestly maintain. Indeed, we regard this as the normal process. The promise is to us and to our children, and our gracious Lord would have all children baptized, that they might inherit the promise; for "except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God," John 3, 5; and "not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Tit. 3, 5. God the Holy Spirit would save all in infancy by the grace administered in the sacrament of regeneration. But it does not follow that a man may, when he has reached the years of discretion, be a Christian without having willed it. A child may, by the power of divine grace, trust in its mighty and merciful Savior in that inexplicable, unconscious way in which it trusts in its mother's love; but as in maturer years, when consciousness is awakened, it can be faithful to its mother only by choosing such fidelity as against the manifold temptations to prove untrue to her love and her lessons, so when maturer years have come can it be true to Christ only by a firm resolve to follow Him, notwithstanding all the evil inclinations of the flesh and all the coincident allurements of the world and temptations of the devil. The grace bestowed upon a child in Baptism is efficacious to its salvation, as there is no conscious action of the will to resist it, and it therefore accomplishes its saving purpose. But that inevitable grace does not necessarily save an adult, because in this case there is a conscious action of the will that must come to a decision between contending influences and that

may be directed against the proffered grace. So clear and so firm has our Church always been in her conviction that the grace of God, as offered in the means, saves all men, unless there be wilful resistance set against it to hinder its operation, that she unwaveringly declares all baptized infants to be regenerated, because infants never wilfully resist. The moral influences brought to bear upon the soul by the Spirit of God never fail to accomplish their purpose, unless the evil power that is in our nature is consciously and deliberately set against them, so that the end would be attained only by ignoring man's personality and trampling down all opposition arising from that source. Grace works in the infant as it does in the adult. All that it can do without violating the order of God in creation it does in both cases. It exerts a power that inevitably produces corresponding effects. But it does not produce conscious and intelligent acceptance of Christ in a subject that is not yet capable of such action. It works in the child only that of which the child by the creative design of God is capable. To argue from this that regeneration is impossible in infants, as has so often been done, is as fallacious in reasoning as it is unscriptural in conclusion. The child cannot intelligently embrace the truth in Jesus and make Him the conscious object of its trust and hope. But this no more precludes the possibility of grace than of sin in its soul. It only implies that the work of grace, like the work of sin, will be modified in form by the natural possibilities of the subject. The child does not deliberately choose between sin and grace, because it does not deliberately do anything. It does not deliberate at all. But it is a sinner, and by grace does become a child of God, although it becomes conscious of either only in course of time, when intelligent choices and decisions are made. Grace inevitably works faith in the unconscious babe, as it will in all men if they become like little children. But that is the difficulty in adults.

When the soul, whether it be by such an inevitable influence as that which is exerted upon babes in Baptism, or by the enlightening power of the Gospel, which in its first effects is equally inevitable, is brought to believe in Christ, an energy has been exerted which is not in our fallen nature.,

and an effect has been produced for which our nature presents no cause. The soul can deliberate and will, but of itself it cannot even know, much less can it choose the spiritually good. When the child has been led to believe in Christ, it has done what by nature it would not do. The same is manifestly the case when an adult has been brought under the influence of the Gospel and led to faith in Christ. He has consciously exercised his will, and he has chosen the good which lay beyond his natural power. In both cases the result was produced by the supernatural power which comes by the Holy Spirit and which, because it is exerted in the mercy of God, without any claim or worthiness on our part, is usually called the power of grace. "By grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God." Eph. 2, 8.

How this supernatural power acts upon the soul of man must, in the nature of the case, remain largely hidden from our eyes. That it does not change our essence, we know from consciousness and from the Word of God. The sinner saved is the sinner that was lost; the person now believing is the same person that before was an unbeliever. "You hath He quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins." Eph. 2, 1. When a person is converted God does not therefore create a new substance, or call into being a person essentially different from that sinful person whom grace converts. In one respect, indeed, it might seem an inadequate representation of the matter to say that God presents new knowledge and through this furnishes new motives for action. No motives will suffice to induce a person to act when and where there is no power of action. But whilst naturally man cannot will the spiritually good, and no offering of natural inducements can result in such willing, grace offers motives that lie above nature, and this not only in the knowledge, but also in the power furnished. By this he can be moved, and God does make appeals to him and does offer inducements designed to influence his will. The change brought about is moral, not physical. In the adult certainly there is a power of choice which is not ignored nor evaded nor trodden down in conversion. But it is only when the Holy Spirit works that such power of choice is morally able to embrace Christ. The soul

is not without will, but because it is spiritually dead it cannot will the spiritually good. Therefore not only new light, and new motives corresponding to the new light, must be introduced, but new power is thus bestowed, which will enable the mind to heed the new light and be influenced by the new motives. It is this that the Scriptures have in view when they use such figures as that of a new creature or a new birth. An energy is introduced that is not of nature, and that enables the soul to do what does not lie in the power of fallen man.

In the nature of the case men could have no sympathy with the revelation that is given in the Gospel. But that revelation is the only means by which the evil will be remedied. "For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." 1 Cor. 1, 21. The proclamation of salvation by divine grace through a crucified Savior must seem to the sinner who needs salvation the most absurd of fancies by which the dignity of man would be insulted, but it was and ever must be the only means by which deliverance from the body of this death can be effected.

The source of this disharmony is found in the depraved heart, in the corrupt affections and desires of many which can find no pleasure in the things which are spiritual. The intellect has formal power in regard to these as well as in regard to other things. Its energies are not the same in degree as before the fall, but they are the same in kind, and therefore when things pertaining to the soul's salvation are set before it, there is no ground for thinking that its formal powers have no existence. They exist and act, according to their own essence, as well in regard to one kind of material as in regard to another. There is no reason whatever for supposing that we cannot as well understand the proposition that salvation is prepared as that dinner is ready, or that we cannot as well make practical inferences from the one fact as from the other. The mere intellectual operation lies within our natural power in both cases alike. That God sent His Son into the world to save sinners can certainly be understood as to the lexical signification of the terms and their grammatical arrangement in the sentence without having experienced the

regenerating grace of the Holy Spirit. What is lacking to the natural man is not the ability to perceive logical relations, but the power to appreciate spiritual truths. When he hears that Christ died to save sinners it is not the same as if this truth were spoken to him in a language of which he has no knowledge. He understands the words; they are not to him meaningless sounds. But his situation is similar to that of the blind man who hears that the lines of the rainbow are beautiful. He lacks that which is essential to a correct apprehension of the truth thus stated. He may have an idea of beauty, but colors lie beyond his powers of cognition, and therefore he cannot rightly apprehend such a proposition, even though all grammatical and lexical conditions for its understanding be fulfilled, so far as this is possible in his situation. The words do not bring him the sense of sight, and without that the lines of the rainbow will not be intellectually realized. So when spiritual things are spoken of, so far as these are matters of individual experience, the soul cannot truly know them without such experience. It is not possible to know what love or hate, what hope or fear is without acquiring this knowledge from our own consciousness, just as we cannot know what white or black, what sweet or bitter is without deriving such information from our own senses. It is on this account, not because the intellect has no intellectual power, that the natural mind does not apprehend the things of God's Spirit. It is a domain of new knowledge, and for the understanding of verbal communications respecting this domain our knowledge derived from other sources will not suffice. As we must have some experience in matters of sense and consciousness before any proposition in regard to them can be understood, so we must have some experience in spiritual things before statements respecting them can be clear to our minds. The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; they are foolishness to him.

But not only is man's mind incapable of understanding and appreciating the heavenly truth revealed for his salvation. The disharmony reaches farther. There is not only a lack of sympathy, but a positive antagonism between divine truth supernaturally revealed and the human soul in its

natural condition. "The carnal mind is enmity against God." Rom. 8, 7. It not only cannot embrace the saving truth, but it cannot of itself otherwise than resist it. "Before man is enlightened, converted, regenerated, renewed, and led by the Holy Ghost, he can of himself and of his own natural powers begin, work, or co-operate as to anything in spiritual things, and in his own conversion or regeneration, as little as a stone or a block of clay. For although he can control the outward members and hear the Gospel, and to a certain extent meditate upon it and discourse concerning it, as is to be seen in the Pharisees and hypocrites; nevertheless he regards it foolishness, and cannot believe it, and also in this case he is worse than a block, in that he is rebellious and hostile to God's will, if the Holy Ghost be not efficacious in him and do not kindle and work in him faith and other virtues pleasing to God, and obedience."* When the good tidings of salvation are proclaimed to man, they encounter nothing but repugnance. From natural sources man can know nothing of the truth that delivers from death; he cannot by any natural powers embrace that truth when it is supernaturally revealed; he can only resist, and by nature does resist, when grace unto salvation is offered in the Gospel.

We are not blind to the difficulties which such a view of man's natural powers presents to the doctrine of conversion. Our task is not to set forth a theory that will remove all difficulties and make an even path for thought, but to present the teachings of Scripture, whether these in their relation to each other be easy or difficult of explanation. But a more thorough examination of the doctrines of the Bible will often show beautiful harmony where a superficial view had shown only inconsistency and even contradiction. It certainly seems, at a cursory glance, as if all human responsibility for continuance in the natural state of death in sin must be denied, if utter inability to do anything towards a restoration to life is affirmed. If, when the Gospel is brought to man, he cannot even understand its contents, much less accept them, how is he ever to be delivered from the bondage in which he lies? When it is said that the very word of the Gospel which brings to him the tidings of salvation contains the

* F. C. II, chap. 2, § 24.

power to call him to life, as the words by which our Lord bade Lazarus come forth conveyed to him the power to comply, the answer is ready: How can the words which a man cannot even understand restore him to life? Is it simply by an exercise of almighty power on the part of God, as it evidently was when our Lord's words restored Lazarus to life? If divine omnipotence produces a change in the creature according to the divine will, without any regard whatever to the will of that creature, it is easy to explain how men are saved and why only few are saved. God's power saves whom He pleases to save, and no one else has anything to do with the matter. But then all human responsibility in the matter of salvation is at an end, and it is worse than absurd, it is cruel and despotic to blame and punish a poor creature for the Creator's declining to save him. If the same words which were spoken to Lazarus had been spoken to the rest of the dead, they too would have come forth, as at the last day all shall and must obey the summons in the general resurrection. That is a matter of God's might with which man's will has nothing to do. But the voice of the Holy Spirit resounds, without converting them, in the ears of many who are spiritually dead. From this fact it is clear beyond dispute that the power of the Gospel is not that of absolute omnipotence which crushes all resistance. "Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost; as your fathers did, so do ye." Acts 7, 51. Men could resist and did resist. The divine power of grace was not such and is not such as to override all human volition. Moreover, the will of the Lord is that all men should be converted and have life, so that if salvation depended merely upon the divine will, all men would be saved. "It is not God's will," says our Confession, "that any one should perish, but that all men should be converted to Him and be saved eternally. Ezek. 33, 11: 'As I live, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live? John 3, 16: 'For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life.' Therefore God, out of His immense, goodness and mercy, causes His divine, eternal law and His wonderful plan concerning.

our redemption, namely, the holy, only saving Gospel of His dear Son, our only Savior and Redeemer, to be publicly proclaimed, and by this preaching collects for Himself from the human race an eternal Church, and works in the hearts of men true repentance and knowledge of sins, and true faith in the Son of God, Jesus Christ."* Again: "We must in every way hold rigidly and firmly to this, that as the preaching of repentance so also the promise of the Gospel is universal, i. e. pertains to all men. Luke 24. Therefore Christ has commanded that 'repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name among all nations.' For God loved the world and gave His Son. John 3, 16. Christ bore the sins of the world (John 1, 29), gave His flesh for the life of the world (John 6, 51); His blood is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world (1 John 1, 7; 2, 2). Christ says, 'Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.' Matt. 11, 28. God 'hath concluded them all in unbelief, that He might have mercy on all.' Rom 11, 32." "Therefore it is Christ's command that to all in common to whom repentance is preached, this promise of the Gospel should be offered. Luke 24, 47; Mark 16, 15."†

From this it is clear that if it were merely a question of God's will, the good tidings would be rejected by none and none would perish. If God would use His omnipotence for man's conversion, such a conversion as would result would be experienced by all men, because His will is that all should repent and believe the Gospel. If He with irresistible power should execute His will, all must needs be saved, because His will is the salvation of all. Hence there must manifestly be some other element requiring consideration in order to bring the truth fully before the mind. If the necessity were laid upon us to seek in the power and grace of God a solution of the problem of human salvation, the result must needs be, not that God has selected some and saves only these by His power, but that God has loved all, desires the salvation of all, has provided for the salvation of all, and by His power effects the salvation of all. But the Scriptures do not so teach. They teach that He loved all and desires to save all, and

* Form. Conc. II. Art. 2, § 49. 50.

† Ib. Art. II, § 28.

offers His grace to all, but that still there are few chosen, though there are many called. The Bible does not give the least countenance to the sectarian notions of Calvinists, that God would have but a few saved, and saves these few by His power, and of the Universalists, that He would have all saved and therefore saves them all by His power. Omnipotence is not employed to save souls. The whole plan of God recognizes the existence of a human will. He who made this does not ignore it in the treatment of the creature gifted with it. God would save all, but the will of man resists the grace of God and many refuse to be saved. "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, but ye would not!" Matt. 23, 37. The Lord alone can save us, and would save us all; but man has the dreadful power of resistance, and many do obstinately resist until the end, and are lost, not because God would not save them, but because they would not be saved, and therefore He could not save them. He could not save them, not because His almighty power is not sufficient to force unwilling souls to heaven, even though it should be by a process so violent and so radical as to change their very identity, but because it would conflict with His plan of salvation, which was formed from eternity and which took into account the nature of man as an intelligent being endowed with will. "That 'many are called and few are chosen,' does not mean that God is unwilling that all should be saved, but the reason is that they either do not at all hear God's Word, but wilfully despise it, close their ears and harden their hearts, and in this manner foreclose the ordinary way to the Holy Ghost, so that He cannot effect His work in them, or, when it is heard, they consider it of no account and do not heed it. For this not God or His election, but their wickedness is responsible."* God uses the Word and Sacraments to change men's hearts, and those who will not use these cannot be converted and saved. Those who hear the Word cannot otherwise than receive power through it, even though they resist it. Indeed there could be no resistance to the contents of that Word, if

* F. C. I. chap. II, § 12.

these did not, independently of any action on the part of man, penetrate into the soul, even though they were not permitted to remain and prosecute the saving work for which they were given.

As God desires the salvation of all men and gives His Word to accomplish His will, and yet some are not saved, man must in some way have something to do with the final result. It does not promote the cause of Christianity among men nor magnify the praises of the Lord, our Righteousness, to make short work of the whole matter by declaring that God saves whom He pleases and we can do nothing whatever in the matter. All experience militates against such a summary decision; and however emphatically minds of a dogmatic temper may maintain it, there are many who will not without scrutiny accept it. And it will not bear scrutiny. It is not true. We err, and we dishonor God and endanger souls by the error, when we concede the truth of a proposition which, notwithstanding the elements of truth which it embodies, contains also palpable falsehood. The subject is not so easy as some are disposed to represent it. God does save us. He saves us by His grace. Man has no claim of merit or worthiness in the case. The glory of our salvation belongs to God, not to man. It belongs wholly and solely to God, in no respect and in no degree to man. That is true. So the Scriptures teach, and so the Church confesses. But the inference is unwarranted that man is required to do nothing in the case.

Right reasoning on the basis of truth revealed in Holy Scripture is allowable; nay more, it is necessary in order to enjoy the full benefit of the revelation which God was graciously pleased to give us. We cannot agree with those who would exclude all reasoning from things spiritual, and thus virtually reduce Christianity to a level with the superstitions that unreasoning men embrace in their blindness. But Christian reasoning must have premises divinely given, and must comply with those laws of thought which God has planted in our nature as part of our mental constitution. False reasoning has no right anywhere, least of all in those paramount matters which pertain to the soul's salvation. And it is false reasoning to conclude that because God saves us by grace He

cannot have so ordered His plan of salvation that man must exercise the powers which God bestowed upon him and which, notwithstanding the ravages of sin, he still possesses. It is simply stupid to maintain that because God sustains our bodily life it is not necessary to eat or drink or sleep. Of course God could support our life without our eating or drinking or sleeping, if it pleased Him to do so; but it has not pleased Him ordinarily to do so, and experience accordingly shows that when man will not eat or drink or sleep, they must die. It is absurd to talk on this account of the merit of eating or drinking or sleeping. Only fanatics can allege that, because man can merit nothing as against God in the matter of his subsistence, he cannot eat or drink or sleep. Experience teaches us better, and reasonable men know better. There is no merit in eating, when God mercifully gives us something to eat. There is no merit even in the work which God gives us to do as a condition of having something to eat, commanding us "that if any would not work, neither should he eat." 2 Thess. 3, 10. All the glory belongs to the Giver of every good and perfect gift. Nothing that man can do will entitle to the glory. So in regard to things spiritual. Nothing that we can do can entitle us to the glory of our salvation. That belongs to God alone, without whom we can do nothing. But that does not decide the question whether in the gracious plan of God He has given us anything to do in the matter of our salvation. That is the question that here confronts us.

The fact that we are saved by grace alone, as the Scriptures certainly teach, does not of itself decide this question. We regard the doctrine that salvation is by grace alone as beyond dispute, and have no controversy with any one on that point. We heartily accept that doctrine because the Scriptures clearly teach it, and with the Church we cordially confess it. But that does not imply, and we do not admit, that on that account nothing is required of man and nothing can be done by man towards accomplishing God's gracious purpose. He can do nothing without Christ and without grace, but that does not imply that he can do nothing through Christ and by grace. He can do nothing meritorious before God, that is certain. Merit and grace are inconsistent. But that does not prove that he can do nothing, whether meritorious or not.

The poor beggar that asks a piece of bread at my door can claim nothing of me as a right. I owe him nothing, and if he demands bread of me as a claim of justice, I will give him nothing. But if in charity I give him the bread which is necessary to support his life, and he claims that the eating is meritorious and therefore put on airs on the ground that he has maintained himself and deserves the credit which, as men speak, belongs to me, but which properly belongs to God, who alone gives our daily bread, I can only regard him as a fool. His acceptance of my charity and his eating of my bread is anything else rather than meritorious. But that by his eating he has done something towards sustaining his life cannot be denied. He has done something, but there is no merit in what he has done. His eating was not the motive which induced us to give him bread, nor was the prospect of his eating any part of the inducement to bestow the gift. I pitied him and wanted to help him; that was all. If he would refuse to eat what I charitably bestowed, that, if I could have foreseen it, might have induced me not to give it, as I might have declined to waste the good gift of God; but his acting was in no sense a claim upon me and was no part of the inducement to give him the bread which charity prompted me to give. So God may decline to impart His gifts of grace where He foresees that they would not be used; but that they will be accepted is in no case and in no sense the motive which leads Him to bestow them. His motive is grace and mercy, only grace and mercy. The decision of His wisdom is to where His grace and mercy would be exercised in vain, is altogether a different matter. His grace is independent of that; He is gracious notwithstanding that; and His grace remains the same when men reject as when men accept. The acceptance is never the motive of bestowal, and never constitutes a claim upon the bestower, so that on that account the gift would be of merit, and not of grace. It is absurd to regard the acceptance of a gift as the meritorious ground of its bestowal.

Of ourselves we cannot believe or be holy. That is beyond all controversy. The Ethiopean cannot change his skin nor the leopard his spots. Man cannot regenerate himself. "By grace are ye saved through faith, and that not of

yourselves; it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast." Eph. 2, 8. 9.

When the grace of God comes by the Gospel to men, who are dead in trespasses and sins, it brings light and power. This inevitably produces an effect upon the soul. It obscures the view from the start so to strain the figure of spiritual death as to make it imply that just as soon as any effect is produced by the Gospel in the soul, spiritual death has given place to spiritual life, and conversion has been accomplished. Our old theologians fell into no absurdity when they represented this as a process that is not at once completed, but goes on gradually. Some of them did, indeed, lay stress upon the fact that there is a moment when the person who was an unbeliever has become a believer and the spiritually dead person has been made spiritually alive, and that in this respect conversion may be called instantaneous. That is true. But that which, when all is in readiness, may take place in an instant need not on that account be denied to be successive and gradual. Where there is a transition from one state to another, as where the child becomes a man or the bud becomes a blossom, there is usually such a change as may in one respect be pronounced gradual while in another it is instantaneous. The exact point at which the youth becomes a man it would be impossible to find, as it is impossible, to use the expression of Chemnitz, to find the mathematical point at which the will of the sinner becomes liberated. The unbeliever does not indeed develop into a believer as the youth develops into a man, and the conversion of a sinner is therefore not strictly analogous to such a growth. The Scriptures rather suggest birth and restoration to life as subjects of comparison. But the fact is clear, however we may seek to illustrate it, that sinners are ordinarily not converted in the instant when the Word of God is first preached to them. Sudden conversions, like that which miraculously took place in the case of St. Paul, are certainly not impossible, but they are just as certainly of rare occurrence. The rule is that the mind labors for a longer or shorter period under conviction of sin through the influence of the law, seeking rest and finding none, and that, when the new truth which the Gospel declares is introduced, the soul is shy of it,

repels it, revolves it, shrinks from it, debates it, rejects it, returns to it, is drawn by it, until in course of time, as it offers precisely what is needed to supply the want which is felt, after much hesitation and vacillation faith is wrought. The creation of faith may be conceived as taking place in an instant, and if conversion is conceived as consisting merely in that one point at which the unbeliever becomes settled a believer, it certainly may be considered instantaneous. The change from the condition of an unbeliever to that of a believer undoubtedly takes place in a moment, if merely the one point be considered of having and not having faith. But the person who in a moment of time passes over from the condition of an unbeliever to that of a believer may have been gradually coming to that point for years. Even the figure of a new birth does not exclude such a gradual process. While the birth may be regarded as taking place in an instant, there was a conception and a growth antecedent to the birth, which occupied a long period of time, during which that was prepared which in one aspect was instantaneous. It would be correct to apply the name conversion to the divine act which brings the soul from darkness to light, from death to life, from bondage to liberty, though we should regard that act simply at the one point where the result of a protected process is attained. In that point the whole matter centers, and in the strict sense that is what is meant by the term which designates the process. But just on that account it would be erroneous to maintain that the successive stages by which the final result is reached have nothing to do with the outcome of the whole, and that the term conversion is misunderstood when it is applied to the entire process. The grace of God only gradually brings about the result which we call conversion, and the various steps and stages by which that result is reached are the conditions under which the end is attained, and are therefore as necessary to conversion as gestation is to birth or budding and blossoming is to fruitage. God works upon the soul for days and weeks, sometimes for months and years, before that soul embraces Jesus by faith as its Savior. It would not be accurate to say that spiritual life existed before conversion; but it would be equally inaccurate to say that nothing which the grace of God accomplishes in

the soul prior to conversion has anything to do with the accomplishment of that end. It is false to say that because conversion consists in the restoration to life of a soul spiritually dead, therefore nothing can be done preparatory to such restoration and no steps can be taken that will gradually bring it about. Such a mechanical view of conversion would find no room for the influence of the law and would necessarily exclude penitence from its conception, so that conversion would by no means be identical with repentance, which consists in penitence and faith ; and it would just as clearly deny to the Gospel with its light and power, prior to the point at which the work is completed, all agency in affecting conversion. Both law and Gospel have an office in producing the spiritual change, and the Gospel has an effect immediately upon its introduction, although that effect is not at once conversion, which may take place by slow gradation or be prevented entirely.

Those who maintain that conversion is a completed fact as soon as there is any impulse of the Spirit felt in the soul, are driven not only to deny that a personal decision is essential to a converted state, but also to affirm that a person has been converted, though it were but momentarily, in whose soul no other effect was produced by the introduction of the powers of grace than that of a transient feeling which is followed by wilful resistance. In such an erroneous theory the inevitable influence of grace exerted through the Gospel, which has always been recognized by the Church, becomes an irresistible grace necessitating conversion, which has with great unanimity been denied by Lutherans in their contention against Calvinism. Men are converted, not as soon as there are any promptings to accept the truth, but as soon as the will is decided to accept it ; and the state of conversion or regeneration continues as long as the will remains decided, so that the means of grace are used in accordance with the volitions necessarily proceeding from a will in such a condition. Only in such a heart does the Spirit dwell and constantly perform His work. "Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His." Rom. 8, 9. That which is characteristic of the converted

state is not that there have merely been some motives of the Spirit felt, or are some felt still, as He strives to enter in and take up His abode there, but that He dwells there as a permanent power against the flesh or the evil nature, which never ceases to counteract the work of grace. "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" 1 Cor. 3, 16. This indwelling with its constant influence is not attested simply by desultory impulses and desires in coincidence with the revelation in the Gospel. These may exist as transient feelings in a soul that is yet without saving faith in Christ, just as there are impulses and desires in the true believer which conflict with the motives of the Holy Spirit. That which forms the criterion of the indwelling of the Spirit and therefore of the state of conversion is the settled condition of the will, as distinguished from the affections and desires, which continue to send out sinful impulses upon the will, but which are resisted by the power of the Spirit that dwelleth in us. In the Christian the will is right, whatever the reason or the feeling may say. "I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing; for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I would I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do. Now if I do that I would not, is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me." Rom. 7, 18-20. The Holy Spirit prompts to holy activities; the unholy nature within us prompts to sin and to resistance against all that is holy. When these holy promptings become personal and habitual, so that they are not merely resisted impulses which are still foreign to our personal life, but have become our own by appropriation through the will, conversion has taken place. Then it is not the Holy Spirit acting through a dead instrument, but a rational being that has will and that has been made spiritually alive acting by the power of the Spirit. Man now uses his will in coincidence with God's will. The flesh or evil nature, notwithstanding its lustings against the Spirit, is in subjection, and what it does, though it is in me, is not properly mine, because it does not accord with the fixed state of my personal will. It is no more I that do that, but sin that dwelleth in me. Nature still has its evil inclinations, but

the person is by this governing purpose determined against them. He consents to none of them; he disowns them; they are not properly his, and are not imputed to him. "He that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that He might destroy the works of the devil. Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for His seed abideth in him; and He cannot sin, because He is born of God." 1 John 3, 8. 9. The sin remains in his nature still, but he does not allow it to master him, and thus to become his personal act. It is in me, and I feel its motions; but it is no more I that do it, since I disown and condemn it. Conversion is the personal decision for Christ and righteousness, made by the power of the Holy Spirit through the Word. As long as there is no such decision there is no conversion.

It is an error that our old theologians supposed conversion to be a physical change effected by divine power, which accomplishes its purpose in an instant. They did not conceive it to be a sudden transformation wrought by divine grace acting after the manner of a physical cause which cannot be resisted. They described the change as gradual. The greatest of our theologians after Luther says: "Conversion or renovation is not a change that is always accomplished and affected in all its parts in a single moment, but it has its beginnings and its advances, through which in great weakness it is perfected. It is not therefore to be understood that I am to wait, with a secure and indolent will, until conversion or renovation has been accomplished, according to the stages already described, by the influence of the Holy Spirit, or without any movement on my part. Nor can it be shown with mathematical accuracy where the liberated will begins to act. But when prevenient grace, that is, the first beginnings of faith and conversion are given to man, the conflict between the flesh and the spirit immediately begins.*

Gerhard presents the subject with his usual fullness and clearness, rejecting the necessitarian or predestinarian theory, on the one hand, and the Pelagian and Synergistic, on the other. He says: "In the work of conversion the Holy Spirit

* Chemnitz Loci Theol. p. 199.

finds a subject who has no powers to cooperate, as the mind of man not yet renewed is blind and his will is turned away from God and hostile to Him. Grace therefore in every way strives to heal and help, that it may change him whom it would convert from an unwilling to a willing, from a hostile to an obedient person. But this does not take place in such a manner as if it converted a man without his thought or knowledge or even against his will, by applying force; but the Holy Spirit confers new powers, through which assent to the call can be given, although He does not immediately in a moment take away that old liberty, or rather deplorable slavery, through which man can reject the proffered grace. Far be it therefore from us to say, that in conversion the grace of the Holy Spirit by a certain physical action determines the will to the volition and choice of the good; for in this way all whom the Holy Spirit desires to convert would be converted by an immutable necessity. The Holy Spirit suffers Himself to be resisted, permits His work to be hindered, and sees many judge themselves unworthy of conversion and its fruit, namely eternal life. The will therefore remains to all men after the fall, but that it wills the spiritually good it has not from its own powers, since it serves sin. Hence the Holy Spirit in conversion renews the will of man and gives it new powers. Endowed with these it can actually will and choose the good. Meantime in virtue of the adhering depravity of his nature he is able not to will the good; he is able to hinder the work of the Holy Spirit; and hence in no manner can it be said that in conversion grace by any physical action determines the will to the volition and election of the good."*

Quenstedt in a lengthy exposition of the subject teaches that there is a prevenient grace "which leads man to the adequate means of conversion, gives him, who was hitherto spiritually dead, the Word containing the power to convert him (Rom. 1, 16; Mark 4, 27), and removes the natural incapacity and unfitness common to all men as regards spiritual things." He then distinguishes between preparing and perfecting grace, and proceeds to define them thus: "That is called preparing grace which, if I may so speak, follows the

* Loci XII, cap. 6, sec. 1, § 57.

prevenient and through the Word applied to the individual acts by restraining the natural and actual repugnance, by affecting the stony and obstinate heart (Ezek. 36, 26; Is. 48, 4) with the hammer of the law, and by expounding the Gospel; and this His operation the Holy Spirit, assisting thus far from without through preparing grace, continues until the person is capable of receiving that highest good, the translation from a state of wrath to a state of grace."†

Baier distinguishes grace into prevenient, operating and cooperating, and defines the former two thus: By prevenient grace "is understood the inspiration of the first holy thought and pious desire by God; and it is called prevenient grace because it is prior to our free consent, or because it thus goes before the decision of the person to be converted." Operating grace is that "which directly follows the beginning of conversion and looks to its continuance, by which it comes to pass that man by an effort, although weak, inclines to Christ the Mediator and to the promises of free remission of sins for Christ's sake, and strives against doubts."‡

Hollaz says: "The regeneration of infants is instantaneous, but the ordinary regeneration of adults is successive. In infants there is found no passionate and obstinate resistance; the grace of the Holy Spirit accompanying baptism breaks and restrains their natural resistance that it may not impede regeneration; hence their regeneration is completed in a moment. But in the regeneration of adult Jews, Mahometans and heathens there are many difficulties for the removal of which care must be exercised, and illumination and instruction extended over a long time are to be afforded from the divine Word, till a full faith is enkindled in the mind."*

All our great theologians agree that while there is a point at which the soul becomes believing, that point is ordinarily not reached in a moment. Whatever differences there may be in the terminology employed, they all teach that there are operations of the Holy Spirit upon the soul prior to the completion of conversion and gradually leading to it, and they are all equally far from adopting the mechanical theory

† Syst. Theol. II. p. 502.

‡ Theol. Pos. IV. cap. 4, § 37.

* Ex. Theol. Acr. III. sec. 1, cap. 7, qu. 14.

which regards the work of grace as completed in an instant by a power acting after the manner of a physical force that overrides all opposition.

In doing this they are in accord with the teachings of Scripture on the subject. These present examples in which the Holy Spirit affected the soul without producing conversion, showing unmistakeably that conversion does not necessarily result from the first impulse of the Spirit. When Stephen preached to the Jews they were "cut to the heart," but they were not converted, the reason for which is given in the statement: "Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost: as your fathers did, so do ye." Acts 7, 52. When Paul taught "concerning the faith in Christ" before Felix, "as he reasoned of righteousness, temperance and judgment to come, Felix trembled, and answered, Go thy way for this time; when I have a convenient season I will call for thee." Acts 24, 25. Felix was manifestly moved by the preaching as the mere powers of nature could not have moved him, but was not converted. When the same apostle preached the truth in Jesus before Agrippa, he said: "King Agrippa, believest thou the prophets? I know that thou believest. Then Agrippa said unto Paul, Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian." Acts 26, 27. 28. Both the words and the subsequent action of the king showed that he was moved by the Word preached and that there was a human resistance to an experienced divine power. This is the experience of millions still. The Word of God takes hold upon them, and they vacillate for days, in some instances for years, between accepting Christ and positively and consciously rejecting Him. That their hearts are not sanctified, so that the good impulses proceed from their own renewed nature, is evident enough. The Holy Spirit does not yet dwell in their hearts by faith, neither are their hearts purified by faith. They are not yet believers. But the Holy Spirit acts upon them nevertheless, and that action is productive of some effects that may be experienced. Whether they will result in conversion is not to be determined by the mere fact of the Spirit's operation. The power thus presented is sufficient in all cases to produce conversion, but may in all cases be resisted by the power of nature which every soul possesses.

In the whole work of conversion man can of himself do nothing and help nothing. God alone performs it. But while we most heartily reject the theory that it is man's work, we just as heartily reject the harsh product of human reason that it is an irresistible work of almighty power. God does not in conversion ignore human nature as He made it and, abandoning that as helpless, create a different nature to enjoy the blessedness in Christ. He does not select a few favorites, whom He rescues by His resistless might, whilst He permits all the rest, whom He could just as easily rescue, to perish forever. He saves us by His grace. But the power of this grace is the same in all; it is irresistible in no case. There is a human power of resistance, and many exercise that dreadful power so that they are not converted, and many exercise it even after conversion, so that they fall from grace. The introduction of converting grace does not render resistance impossible in any soul. Grace is no more irresistible in the case of some than in the case of others. All may resist, and when they do, they do it not because under the circumstances they *must*, just as those who accept Christ do not believe because they *must*. If they resisted because they *must*, they could never recognize the justice of a condemnation based upon that rejection, as there could be nothing but partiality in the forced conversion and salvation of the others. The grace of God saves, but it does not force salvation upon any soul.

It is argued that the power to resist the grace of God does not imply the power to refrain from such resistance. We admit this. All men naturally have the power to resist, and all men naturally use that power. But when the grace of God comes to man it conveys a power which nature does not possess and renders possible what was impossible before. So far as the truth is brought to the human intelligence it inevitably exercises an influence. While the Gospel seems foolishness in the way it offers for escape from the ills that are upon us, it appeals to the intelligence of men when it offers hope in our wretchedness and enkindles some desires for the better remedy than nature offers. We may stubbornly resist the light and crush all rising desires, and do so to our own eternal sorrow; but we are not necessitated so to resist.

A provision for our salvation that would claim to be universal and still would fail to render it possible to all, would be sadly faulty and would thus bear the marks of a human contrivance. God is rich in mercy and wise in counsel. The Gospel is the power of God. When it comes to man, it brings all that is needed for the accomplishment of its purpose. Its design is to save every soul to whom it comes. It has the power for this. Men can resist it by the power of nature. They cannot otherwise than resist it by the power of nature, because nature can furnish no motions and motives that do not share our natural depravity. But when the power of grace is introduced and new motives are presented to the soul, there is a power present which can do otherwise than resist. By the power of grace the resistance of nature is neutralized and may be overcome. When conflicting motives are present in the soul, there is no necessitating force that decides which shall win. Compliance with neither is necessary; obedience to either is possible. When grace exercises its influence upon man, it may lead to faith; it is false to say that it must. The corrupt nature may lead to a rejection of Christ; it is false to say that it must. Grace inevitably introduces a new power into the soul which does not work irresistibly and thus necessitate faith, but which does prevent nature from working irresistibly and necessitating unbelief and eternal damnation.

It has been argued that if man can by natural power refrain from resistance to grace, he can do a spiritually good work, and that consequently all our theologians, since they maintained that wilful resistance explains why some are not saved when grace comes, are synergists, though perhaps in most cases unconsciously. But the truth is that where grace enters the soul a power superior to that of nature enters, and although it is not irresistible, it will in all cases furnish the stronger motive and can fail only when there is a stubborn rejection. Just because the grace does not furnish irresistible motives, its impulses may be resisted. But the natural resistance is not necessarily overcome by grace. No powers move the will by necessity. These powers act as motives, and the soul may stubbornly resist the light and the truth and follow the desires of nature, though its own reason see the folly of

its course. It may, too, under the influence of grace, accept the truth. The Holy Spirit leads man to believe; does not believe for them nor force them to believe. They cannot believe by nature, but they can refuse to believe when grace works, and they can then accept Christ by believing. We do not regard it as correct to say that man can by nature omit wilful resistance to divine grace. Any resistance that can arise in the soul can be omitted by such power as the soul at the time possesses. To us it seems a palpable absurdity to say that a person wills what he could not have declined to will. By an instinctive action his nature may, before consciousness has been developed, move his will, so that by accident the person could not will otherwise. He could not choose otherwise simply because he could not yet use his judgment to make a choice. But just on that account there can in such cases be no action that is wilful. This always implies deliberation. We never act wilfully where the matter has not been considered and where the decision has not been reached in spite of opposing motives. A babe commits no wilful sin. Neither child nor adult can do otherwise than sin, but an adult can do no wilful sin unconsciously, just as a child, because as such it is unconscious of the character of its acts, cannot sin wilfully at all. When we do a thing wilfully we decide in favor of it notwithstanding adverse reasons and motives. But we do not choose when there is no alternative. If we resist the grace of God wilfully, it is because there was some inducement not to resist and an opportunity to choose not to resist. The grace of God is then present and moves the soul against the motions of the flesh. When the unconverted sinner refrains from wilful resistance he simply does nothing, as the Rostock Faculty has argued; but he does nothing in spite of the motions of the flesh to resist, and he does nothing because grace counteracts the evil and motives to do something. The omission of wilful resistance implies the suppression of the resistance which is natural to the sinful soul. The natural mind is enmity against God. The wilful resistance is certainly based on this natural resistance and can never exist apart from it. Where the natural resistance is overcome there will and can be no intensification of that resistance into wilfulness. Grace never acts in such a way as

to crush resistance. It never does more, even in the most vigorous believer, than furnish the strength for overcoming. All Christians experience the power of remaining sin, and need the warning to take heed lest they fall. The evil that is in them may at any time develop into wilful resistance even after conversion and years of service. The wilful resistance is something superadded to the natural, and has its distinctive character in the conscious decision and choice of the will. Now as man cannot by his natural power overcome the resistance that lies in his nature, he cannot by his natural power do anything that would render that resistance harmless when grace is offered. But the whole subject is obscured by such an abstract presentation. The natural resistance never can deepen into wilful resistance so long as there is no new light and power against which it may direct itself. Wilful resistance in its very nature implies knowledge of that against which it is directed and a decision against it notwithstanding motives offered in its favor. When grace is offered, the time of decision has come. If the soul accepts it, this is not because it had the natural power of suppressing the contrary motives and yielding to the influences of grace. If nature had been permitted to have its own way unmolested, there could have been wilful resistance to the grace offered, because the evil nature, which man has no power to overcome, leads to a personal decision in accordance with that nature, unless some other power intervene. But if wilful resistance did not result, it was because nature was not permitted to have its own way, and that which interfered was not the power of nature, but the power of grace. The grace is introduced into the soul inevitably when the means are used, and when the hour of decision has come it is in the power of the subject to choose, because the power of grace is present. There never is wilful resistance to grace where there is no power of grace exerted, and hence there never is a refraining from wilful resistance where there is not the power of grace to resist nature and prevent its deliberate decision against Christ. This grace makes the acceptance of Christ by faith possible, and does so in every case, because it introduces the supernatural forces into the soul which are sufficient to overcome the natural; it makes the acceptance of

Christ necessary in no case, because the power of grace is not irresistible and nature may lead to a decision against it in wilful resistance. Grace brings powerful motives to bear upon the soul, but it does not coerce the will. If it did, all who hear the Gospel, in which the grace of God is conveyed to man, would undoubtedly be converted. God alone saves men, and saves them by His grace alone; but that grace does not ignore the human will. It does not seize some and thrust them into the kingdom of God as a straying sheep may be seized and carried back to the fold by physical force. It appeals to the human soul, which is like a block so far as any spiritual ability to help itself is concerned, but which is by no means like a block so far as its treatment by the grace of God is concerned. If the latter were the case, our dear Lord would without doubt pitch them all into the blissful receptacle prepared for His people. But He has made us men and treats us as men, not as vegetables or brutes, and therefore calls us by the Gospel and enlightens us by His gifts, so that the will may be led to own Him as Lord and live under Him in faith and holiness. But the will cannot will by coercion. That is a contradiction. The will that was enmity against God cannot consciously be subject to His saving will without light and power that change its decision. A soul so endowed would be a different soul, not the soul that was called by the Gospel. The will is always led by motives, after the power of God is introduced, as well as before, and these motives are never irresistible. Grace presents such motives for embracing Christ, but does not necessitate acceptance. Why in some souls, when the Gospel exerts its power, the decision is in favor, in others it is against the influence of grace, we do not know. But we do know that it is not because God wills and decides it so, as some reason against the Scriptures.

When we speak thus of the will as being impelled by motives to accept Christ, it may be necessary to remind the reader that we are speaking of the will formally considered and of the power of divine grace as influencing to the acceptance of Christ. The objection has therefore no foundation, that when we assume the will to have power to perform the spiritually good act of accepting Christ as soon as the appro-

priate motive is presented, we at the same time assume that natural power is sufficient to produce faith. By our own reason or strength we can not believe in Christ or come to Him. But we can, when the Holy Spirit works in us, believe in Christ and come to Him, though we cannot do it by our own reason or strength. The power is given us by the Holy Spirit, and that power is not physical, but moral. He does not forcibly take hold of the soul and drag it to the Savior, but He exerts His saving power in the form of motive impelling, but not compelling the soul to the acceptance of Christ. "For the Holy Ghost," says our Confession, "will be with His Word in His power, and this is the drawing of the Father." What we do maintain is that the soul has the essential power of knowing God and willing to serve Him, and that when conversion takes place no essentially new faculty of intellect and will is created; but that the soul is liberated from its chains, so that it can know and believe the saving truth as it can know and believe other things. The liberating power is called grace; and this enters by the Word, giving light and furnishing motives which nature does not yield, but which are spiritual, and yet no more necessitating corresponding action than do any other light and motives. When the power of the Holy Spirit is introduced into the soul man is of course entirely passive. From himself such power cannot come. It is not in him and cannot be developed out of anything that is in him. But he is not converted as soon as this regenerating power is introduced. He may reject it, just as he may reject any solicitations or impulses arising from his own nature and impelling to specific action. He is capable of impulses given by a higher power than his own, or he could never be converted, and he is capable of resisting all higher impulse, or he would not be human. The power of choice belongs to his created nature, and when the foreign power of grace is introduced it can, under the new influence and impulse which is thus imparted, exert that power as it can in all other cases. Conversion is the exercise of that power of choice in the acceptance of the blessed gift which is offered simultaneously with the power to accept it, the Gospel being at once the revelation of the righteousness of Christ and the power of God unto salvation. Some theologians

have therefore distinguished between regeneration and conversion, applying the former term to the inevitable introduction of grace and the latter to the conscious personal appropriation of the saving gift, and alleging that babes are capable of the former but not of the latter. The fact is certainly undeniable that the Scriptures often call upon man to turn to God or to repent, and thus recognize his responsibility, while his passivity in conversion is unquestionable, inasmuch as all power for it must be given by the Holy Spirit. No man is converted before he personally accepts Christ by an act of will, and that always implies choice. He would not be converted if he were coerced.

That which causes difficulty and doubt in the minds of many is the false conception of man's spiritual disability. If man is dead in sin, if he can no more change his condition than the Ethiop can change his skin, if he is like a block or a stone, it is manifest that some mighty power must produce a change in him before he can be spiritually a different person. This thought is pursued to an extreme which implies that man has no longer a will, if he has a soul at all, and that by God's creative power a will must be called into existence before he can embrace Christ. The error of Flacius that sin is man's essence and that conversion consists in creating faculties which the sinner did not before possess, influences the thinking of many who perhaps would not accept it as a developed theory. But man has a soul that lives before conversion, although it has not spiritual life, and it can think and will before conversion, although it cannot think and will the spiritually good. What conversion effects is not the annihilation of the sinful essence and the creation of another that is not sinful. It is not the substitution of a new soul with holy powers for the old soul with sinful powers. Nor is it the creation of a new, pure soul that shall take its place alongside of the old, corrupt soul. Such a theory is very enticing, as it renders the whole matter clear and comprehensible. But it is palpably false. The sinner converted is precisely the same person that he was before, although morally he has undergone a great change. This Spirit of God acts upon the soul, but may be so resisted that this change is never effected.

The conduct of man in reference to the divine will differs from the beginning to the end of God's work for their salvation. Some will heed the invitations to attend church and listen to the reasons for giving attention to the preaching of the Gospel; some will resist all appeals looking to this end. Some, when they have been induced to enter the church, will give attention to what is proclaimed, some will persistently refuse. Some, when they have given attention sufficient to admit the first rays of saving truth, will meditate upon it and let it penetrate into the inner recesses of the soul; some will not yield to its power any further and close all avenues to the Spirit's prosecution of His saving work. Some, when they have meditated upon the good tidings of the Gospel, are led by the power of God to embrace them and rejoice in them; some will go no further, but decline to accept Christ as their Savior. Some, when they have believed in Christ and found peace unto their souls, continue in the truth until the end and receive the crown; some fall away and are lost, notwithstanding all that God had done for their salvation. At every stage of the work, whether in the order of providence or of grace, man has the power to resist, and at every stage some do resist. For going to church and hearing the Gospel motives may be presented that appeal to the natural man. A man may, without understanding or believing the Gospel, hope to find in it what will satisfy the longing of his soul, and may thus hear and meditate from other than spiritual motives, until the Word heard introduces these spiritual motives.

When in some cases men decide to hear the Word and in others refuse to hear it, the decision is made by the will. Why one, when reasons are presented, will go to church and hear while another refuses to go, or to hear if he does go, it is impossible for man to discover. The will is not necessitated by the motives presented. These have the same force in all cases. They are influences upon the will, in no case physical causes coercing it. Why the will is determined differently in the case of different persons, though seemingly the inducements are the same in all, is an unfathomable mystery, which is found in all volition.

When the Word is purely preached and "men listen at-

tentively and earnestly, and meditate upon it," conversion ensues by the power which that Word conveys. But this is because audience is given to it, so that it can exert its influence on the soul. If it is not heard at all, or if it is not heard with attention, that influence is not exerted and the result is not attained. One who hears may give earnest heed on account of the appeal made to his natural man, until new powers are bestowed through such hearing and an appeal can be made to these new spiritual powers. Why one will hear attentively and thus receive the gifts of the Spirit, while the other will not, is the same mystery of the will as why one will hear at all and the other will not. Volition is never caused in the physical sense.

Conversion has not taken place as long as the will has not been moved to accept Christ. The inevitable result of the Gospel in the soul is not conversion. If it were, grace would be irresistible, and all who hear the good tidings would be converted. There are some inevitable results produced when the Gospel is preached, just as there are some inevitable impressions made when objects are presented to the senses. But these inevitable results have no moral character. So far as anything is forced upon a person, and he is affected by it simply because he cannot help it, it would be preposterous to maintain that he is radically changed by it. The Gospel does bring to the intellect knowledge which could be obtained from no other source, and the entrance of the Word does give some light, whether the soul desires it or not. This knowledge inevitably produces some emotions and desires also, which could not arise in the soul without such supernatural light and such influence of grace. Other motives are thus introduced than those which naturally direct the volitions, and under the influence of these the Gospel is heard further and more attention is given to its message; or, under the influence of the heart's natural resistance to the truth in Jesus, the subject is dismissed from the mind, and it declines to pursue it further. That which induces the soul to give more earnest heed to the Gospel message may in the first instance be a natural desire to escape the damnation of hell or to enjoy the promised glories of heaven, and only by degrees may that natural desire be sanctified by the continued grace which

makes Christ precious and righteousness delightful, so that the motive is no longer mere enjoyment, but Christ our Righteousness. We may resist the motives present, and refuse all additional light and grace, or we may will the further hearing, and under the increased influences of the truth heard may go from step to step until the decision is made to follow Christ. Why under the same influences different persons decide differently we do not know. It is the mystery which confronts us everywhere in the decisions of the will. God offers the same grace to all men, who all have the same nature; and yet the result is different in different cases, just as the decisions of the will, when other than spiritual topics are under consideration, are different in different persons, although the circumstances are the same. The will is not forced by nature to decide against Christ; it can do otherwise when the power of grace is brought to the soul by the Word. The will is not forced by grace to decide for Christ; it can do otherwise under the power of nature. Why in some persons nature prevails, so that there is wilful resistance that withstands conversion, and in others grace prevails, so that there is willing obedience to the impulses of the Word, we simply do not know, as we do not know in any case why the will decides as it does.

Those who have given any adequate attention to the nature of the will must have become convinced that, if the doctrine of Determinism or Necessitarianism be rejected, there are no causal forces, in the proper sense of the term, exerted upon the will. Either some power drives us helplessly along, as the dead leaves are driven before the wind, or the will originates action under the motives that imply alternative power. We have shown, and we regard it as highly important both for philosophy and theology that it be insisted on, that motives are not causes in the physical sense. The evil passions that lead a person to murder do not render him a helpless and irresponsible instrument, as the axe is a helpless and irresponsible instrument in the hands of the murderer. The human will is no such instrument, and human thoughts and sentiments are no such forces irresistibly wielding such an instrument. All experience shows that we may judge rightly and still wrong, and that our feelings may be right

and our actions still be wrong. Those have little knowledge of that wonderful creation called the soul, who suppose that it moves as the stars move in their course, or as the bee or beaver performs its task and fulfills its mission. The star and the flower and the bird have no choice, and therefore have no account to render. They move as God made them to move, and have no virtue or vice, no merit or demerit. Their movements are necessitated and they have no responsibility for the action of the causes to which they are subject. But the will is not thus subjected to physical powers. It is a power of choice; its actions are not the unavailable effect of antecedent causal forces. Those who maintain that grace is irresistible, sin against psychology as well as against the Scriptures. There is no irresistible force in the domain of the will. The motives that are brought to bear upon it may move it, but it is utterly false to say that by necessity they must move it. The same motives, exercised in the same circumstances, may move some and fail to move others. That depends not simply on the inherent power of the motive; it depends also on the person whose will is in question. No motives compel the will; indeed, it would cease to be will if this were possible; an action that is compulsory cannot be voluntary. The will indeed as it is by nature, cannot do otherwise than sin, but that is not because there is any necessitation, but because there are no impulses or motives to anything else than to sin, and the choice therefore lies only between things that are sinful. What is lacking for good is not physical, but moral power. The impulses in our nature are, because of the corruption that the fall has introduced, only evil continually. There are no good impulses, and therefore all action is sinful. When grace is bestowed, new forces act upon the will, so that it may decide in favor of the good, though all its inclinations by nature are evil. But it is not compelled to decide thus. There never is compulsion exercised upon the will. In every case it has, and according to its very essence must have, the power of choice. It chooses between the acts presented by nature, though the choice is evil because all the alternatives are evil. It chooses still when new powers are introduced.

To the doctrine that conversion is a personal decision to

embrace Christ and follow Him, it is objected that this is synergistic. The ground of the objection is simply that the will is said to act in the direction of the good before conversion is completed. That this act of the will takes place only by the powers of grace introduced by the Gospel, without which there could be no such decision of the will, although these powers do not necessitate such decision, is not accepted as a sufficient answer. Still it is urged that man wills the spiritually good, and that this is derogatory to divine grace. But what is it that such objectors want? Do they desire that man shall not believe at all, and that God shall do the believing for him, so that by nature he is unable to believe, he never even by grace obtains the ability? Or do they desire that man shall believe without willing it, so that when he becomes a follower of Christ he becomes what he does not will to be and cannot help? If not, the only alternative is that they accept the old and sound doctrine that God works in the souls of men both to will and to do of His good pleasure, although He does not work this by conversion. God works all good, but not in such wise that men have no choice and thus have no will in the matter. By His grace He supplies all that is necessary to accomplish this purpose without necessitating it and rendering the motive power irresistible. It is obvious that those who raise the cry of synergism against such a doctrine of grace, on the ground that it still recognizes the need of a decision on the part of the human will under the influence of grace, do so in the interest of an absolute Predestinarianism and of a Determinism that refuses to recognize the distinctive character of the human will. Such men never will be satisfied with us unless we accept the doctrine that grace recognizes no human will, but that God, without regard to human volition or choice in the matter, by the exercise of His almighty power, which human weakness would in vain endeavor to resist, makes believers of whom He pleases and leaves in unbelief and misery whom He pleases. They inculcate the old and cheerless philosophy of Necessitarianism. If they admit that man wills at all when he is converted, as they sometimes do, though, as a coerced will is no will at all, they do so very inconsistently, they commit the same fault which they charge

upon us, as in that case both teach that man wills and both teach that he wills by the power of grace, the only difference being that according to their doctrine he is forced to will and cannot help it, according to ours he is led by grace and does it voluntarily.

It is plain that there may be cognitions imparted and that there may be desires awakened which lead to no violations. This must not be overlooked in considering the nature of conversion. Is a person converted when the Gospel has brought the truth to his intellect without reaching his heart? Is a person converted when certain vague desires for something better are aroused, though nothing better results in will or work? As regards the former there is little controversy. A man may know truth without accepting it. But as regards the other point there is some doubt. There are those who pronounce a person converted as soon as he has any good desires, and do so on the seemingly sufficient ground that a person can have no good desires by nature, and must therefore have undergone a change when such desires exist. But the whole argument is illusory. In the first place, the desire to be a better man, the desire to have the happiness which Jesus promises, are not good in such sense that they could not exist in the unregenerate man, and one deceives himself when he regards such desires as an infallible sign of conversion. In the second place, the desire to be free from the curse of sin and to enjoy the peace arising from the assurance of pardon, and the impulse to seek this in the atoning blood of Christ set before men in the Gospel, which are never a product of our sinful nature, may be awakened by the Holy Spirit without having effected a settled habit in the soul. They are suggestions from without, not motions of the person. What is necessary yet to conversion is the decision of the will. If our doctrine were that this must be made by the power inherent in our nature, there would undoubtedly be reason for the charge of synergism. Our nature can only resist, and when wilful resistance arises against the knowledge and the motives introduced by the Word, it is the power of nature exclusively that leads to such a determination of the will against it. On the other hand, when the will, instead of fortifying itself against the truth in Jesus, is decided

to accept the Redeemer and believes in Him, it is the power of grace exclusively that leads to such a determination of the will for Christ. It is true, this determination is the act of the person converted. He believes; he resolves to follow Christ. But the decision is a result which must be ascribed entirely to the influence of grace. This brought the light and the power to the soul. This alone supplied the necessary motive. But the acceptance of Christ has not taken place as long as the impulses of the Holy Ghost are ineffectual to produce other than involuntary action within us. *Man* must believe, not the Holy Spirit. *I* must trust in Jesus. This by nature I cannot do, the Holy Spirit alone enables me to do it. Man is passive in the reception of gifts enabling him to believe, but he is not a passive agent who, because God is in Him and believes, is called a believer, though he does not himself believe at all. As long as the work of God in the soul has consisted in motions that have not led it to a personal decision, the person is still in the service of sin; as soon as the governing purpose has been brought about in the soul that Christ shall be accepted as Savior and Lord, the service of the Lord is entered upon, though there still be desultory volitions, arising from the flesh, that are not in harmony with this generic volition formed under the influence of the Holy Ghost. To effect such a new governing purpose it is not necessary to annihilate the soul which naturally has no power to form it, nor to create a new soul which should naturally possess such power; what is necessary is only that the Spirit of God should bring the new supernatural truth to the soul with its inherent supernatural power to bring souls into harmony with it. This will in all cases produce such a decision where the person does not stubbornly sin against the light. The power of grace supplies impulses which are capable of leading to a determination of the will in favor of accepting the truth in Jesus, but which are motives, not physical causes, and therefore do not work irresistibly. The power of nature is sufficient to reject all offers of grace, but is not irresistible; the power of grace is sufficient to overcome nature, but neither is it irresistible. Conversion or wilful resistance must inevitably be the result when the power of grace comes to the soul by the Word;

neither of them is necessary, as motives are not necessitating forces under whose operation the will has no choice; which of them will result depends not on a choice of God, which would of course in all cases be that the soul should be converted, but upon the choice of the individual. If he embraces Christ, it is only by the power of grace, without which there would have been in him nothing but enmity to the Gospel; if he abides in sin, his condemnation is just, because he had the power offered him to escape death, but he would not.

L.

MIRACLES.

“And ye shall be as God,” said the tempter to the progenitors of our race. And they believed the words spoken to them. The result is, not that they and their progeny are exalted to the powers and pleasures of deity but, that man is become the fool who says in his heart, There is no God, and that he suffers the penalty of his folly. Nevertheless, he cannot forget the lying assurance; he cannot rid himself of its alluring charm, though it is the charm of certain death and damnation. Men will be as God; and in the wicked and ruinous endeavor they either so detract from the majesty of God’s being and doing, or so add to the littleness of their own unworthy selves, that the distinction between the divine and the human, between the supernatural and the natural, between the good and the bad, is almost completely wiped out. That is, in their own presumption; and wholly blinded by the conceit they think themselves as gods and say; There is no one above us; and that any should have the rule over us, we will not. There must be no thoughts other than man himself can think, no mysteries which he cannot unravel, no deeds which his hands could not do, were he only to try; there must be no authority beyond his own, no pleasures except such as please him, and no glory unless it fall on himself; in short, there must be nothing higher than humanity as it is and as it is to be, than humanity real and potential. Such is the fool who has said in his heart, There is no God, and who himself will be God.

Than this atheist, the deist and many a one among the theists are not much better. They will not wholly reject the old lie and completely throw off the coils of the charmer. God, since God then is, must be made as small as possible. In order to do this they distort both the words and the works of His self-revelation. The Word declares Him who utters it to be infinite in power, in wisdom, in righteousness, in mercy, in glory and majesty; but not too much to humble human pride its voice must be in somewhat subdued and in somewhat silenced altogether. Likewise, "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth His handy work." And as is the Master's work, so is His praise, great and marvelous beyond all that men can think and say. But it is just this transcendent greatness and excellence of God's works which cut to the quick the vain and presumptuous heart of man; and, instead of humbling himself and joining in the common praise, he kicks against the pricks, sets himself up as a fellow to his Maker and plays the critic on the works of the Almighty.

There was a time when such things as divine mysteries and miracles were held to be possible not only, but when their reality might be admitted and credited without incurring the danger of expulsion from the world of thinkers. But that was long ago. As criticism advanced and pushed its lines more and more into the mysteries of mind, of matter and of motion, it was found that miracles had vanished. In our own day, according to the pronouncements of God's critics, there is nothing left of the miraculous in any of His creations and movements; of the marvelous, indeed, a little remains, but in due time science will conquer that too. Nor will we have long to wait, seeing what strides human thought has made in this department of research. Only for a little while are we asked to wait, to suspend all judgment, to walk by no other faith than by that of their own assurances, and then we shall see—by the torch of science we shall see all the things of God as He Himself sees them. Such are the promises held out by a rationalistic and deistic philosophy whose working principle seems to be that nothing is and nothing moves which the mind of man is not able to explain; so that whatever it fails to explain, simply is not.

In the meantime what say the thinkers in the Church to such speculations of the pure reason which pretends to piety? That there is a clash here between history and philosophy, between the word of God and the say-so of men, is evident. The record of Christian Apologetics, rather of much that goes by that name, is generally not the most glorious; and with reference to the question of miracles in particular it presents much it cannot be proud of. The fact is well known that no matter how foolish a theory science or philosophy, such as they are, may bring forward, if it have any antagonistic bearing on the Scriptures, a thousand D.D's are at once ready to bring the wisdom of God into accord with the foolishness of men. But now, belief in miracles is scriptural and demanded of us by God who has wrought them and declares them unto us; but belief in miracles is at the same time pronounced unscientific, unphilosophical, and "thinkers" cannot respect it. What a dilemma for the apologist; that is, for him who courts the favor both of God and of man. How be it, he who said, And ye shall be like gods, has many ways in petto that are made to appear as leading out of just such difficulties. He makes possible for men, as in other things so in this, to be "great thinkers" and "good believers" all in one. What sort of thinkers and believers such men are, it is superfluous to point out. With a chuckle no doubt, yet very truthfully at the same time the Hegelian Zeller—a vulgar rationalist—speaks of them as the school of modern theologians "who have too much culture to believe in miracles, and still are too considerate to deny them." Men, therefore, who have not the courage of their own convictions.

It seems that Christian apologetics has largely fallen into evil hands, and that much harm is done to the good cause of Christ. That rationalizing theologians are found to be so active in this particular field of thought, is perhaps quite natural. To begin with, they have too much faith in the powers of man and too little in the power of God. They fear that the Word of the Lord will not endure forever unless they back it up with their own wisdom; that the truth from heaven can have no course and make conquests below, unless they make it acceptable to human reason; that the cross will not stand except they support it with machinery of their

own contrivance; and that the gates of hell will prevail against the Church after all, unless its doors be widened. Then too it is to be feared that, while they would not be without the favor of God, they are covetous of the good will and the praises of men. However, be that as it may, too many have set themselves up as defenders of the Bible and of its faith who have proved traitors to the cause. There has been, and there is, too much connivance at, and compromise with the vain speculations of the worldly wise.

In their attempt to define the real nature of a miracle so far as that can be done, we find that up to the sixteenth century the teachers of the Church and her defenders all with one accord assert not only the infinite power and wisdom of God but also that He without all condition and with absolute freedom puts to use such power and wisdom. Whether the sharp line of distinction between the natural on the one hand and the praeter and supra-natural on the other is at all discoverable was a question which does not seem to have troubled them. At least we are not aware that they made search for it, or that they ever pretended to have found it. Hence, in their simple faith in the God "which doeth great things and unsearchable, marvelous things without number," they had no self-regulating, much less a self-existent, world to take care of lest anything foreign to it creep in and do mischief or dishonor it. There was then no "natural order of things," such as cannot deviate from its path, no, not by the breadth of a hair. Laws of nature immutably fixed and universally binding as to time and place, and that for God no less than for men, were not to be accounted for at that date. In their minds there was nothing of the kind to hinder them from seeing a miracle, were God pleased to do one among them. All these things are of a later and, it is said, of a more enlightened day.

Miracles had thus far been looked upon as extraordinary works of the Almighty and wrought by Him with means and in ways different from those operating in nature: as works which always transcended and sometimes directly contravened the simply natural. But with the dawn of the day in which men are said to do their own thinking, the old definition was found unsatisfactory by many. Then were those

who, when philosophic and religious thought was emancipated from much unlawful authority, threw off also much that was divinely imposed. They aspired to a more independent way of reasoning. While they made their escape—thanks to the liberating influence of God's truth again come to light—from the bonds of human tradition and superstition, they, by a fault wholly their own, became slaves to the pride of intellect.

These do not reject the God who does wonders, if only you suffer them to put their own construction upon the wonders done by Him. Why, it is hard to tell; but according to some of this school the idea of *creative* power must not be allowed to enter into the constitution of a miracle. "But if the Lord make a new thing," the newness of it can only be relative, not absolute. To make this plain, if not to prove it at the same time, some kind of a *dispositio obedientialis* is ascribed to all created things; and then, it is further asserted, that at the time of their creation God implanted in them what are called *causas primordiales*, from which He, the wonderworking God, as the *prima causa* can produce at will what to us are miracles. From this it would seem that miracles are the late effects of old causes suddenly made operative—a kind of fruit springing up from seed planted in the beginning of time.

Another, profiting by the suggestion made, informs us that miracles are things brought about by a skillful combination of powers somewhere latent in nature. By an accelerated process in the workshop of nature—at times analogous to, at times identical with chemical processes—something irregular and uncommon is effected. That the matter employed and the energies at work here are wholly of this world, on that the doctors of this school are all agreed. But while some of them humbly yet hopefully confess that the exact nature of these elements are as yet not known, others among them make bold to assert that will-power, heat, magnetism, electricity, the endless capabilities of matter and the like, are all-sufficient to account for all the extraordinary phenomena that do really occur. The manner, even, in which these forces active and passive are mediated, combined, set in motion and made to do things which to common mortals seem strange and wonderful, seems to be in course of discovery; for we are

told that what are called miracles are things produced by certain powers intensified and concentrated in the persons doing them, notably in the founders of religion. This is no doubt considered quite an advance in the science, inasmuch as by it, if it does not wholly do away with divine agencies, man and God are by a few removes at least brought nearer to each other, seeing that man, too, can do wonders. That God in times past gave such powers to certain men, as the Scriptures tell us—that is not the idea here; rather that all men are createdly in possession of these powers to some extent, and that under given conditions they become manifest, rarely though it transpires that these conditions meet as required.

Closely related to this pantheistic theory is the *preternatural*. For its basis it borrows from astronomy the plurality of worlds and from the Bible the fall of man and the temporal degeneration of his abode consequent to it. Combining the utterances of science and of Scripture, and adducing the one in support of the other, a theory results which is quite plausible. Does not Jude tell us of “angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation?” Does not the Savior speak of “everlasting habitations” and of heavenly barns into which the wheat of the good husbandman is to be gathered in the day of harvest? And did not, according to Job, the morning stars sing together when the Lord laid the foundations of the earth and the measures thereof? Now what can that first estate, those everlasting habitations be, other than these very morning stars which sang at the birth of things? And these, what can these be other than what in astronomy is called the stellar universe? And in these multitudes of worlds beings live and move, who, were they to appear among us, would seem to us gods; then powers are at work which, were they to be plied in the things of earth, would greatly astound us; and then laws obtain by which were things about us governed would fill our world with miracles. Now when these beings and powers and laws of other worlds—of the stars, say—play over into our own little world, as sometimes they do, then wonders are done. Before its degeneration, it is added, our own solar system was peopled much after the same fashion, favored with like forces and governed by similar laws, as it shall be again in the day

of its regeneration be made like unto, and one of the great system of worlds. Even at present, we are assured, our own abode is potentially what it once was and what in some day it shall be again. Now the ban of sin is on all things. Were but the man found among us who is holy enough and these very powers and laws, of another world as they would seem to be, should be at his command. Things would then be done which should make us gape and stare like an Indian before an old Dutch wind-mill.

Among the definitions proposed by theorists of this class, we find the following. "Miracles are nothing but natural effects—*Natureeffete*—, such as excite the astonishment of mankind and as necessarily accompany the revealing interposition of God or of His messengers in the course of our earthly life. . . . They never in any way oppose the forces and laws of nature; though indeed they do take place in such a way that the forces of nature, which by fallen man are manipulated but imperfectly and impotently, are liberated and made efficacious far beyond the ordinary, and this by the opposition to them of higher heavenly powers; then, that beside the known natural laws new and higher laws appear in which the harmony of the earthly and the heavenly—*der Erden- und Himmels-Natur*—, or, if you prefer, the real powers and capabilities of common nature, which by sin are much obscured, manifest themselves."* In this connection it is stated that as we proceed from the lower to the higher plane of knowledge we will discover that miracles are nothing but the products of a superior order of things, that is, of our own present order of things transfigured and made glorious as originally it was. To a full and empirical knowledge of this, however, we shall not attain until after the palingenesis in store for the world. Then shall we all see, as some see now, that wonders are not really *miracula* but at best *mirabilia*.

Though not so much as among the naturalists, there appears also among the praeternaturalists, at least on the part of many, an irrepressible dread that they may in some way or other say something prejudicial to nature, that is, to nature as it exists in the conceit of modern physicists. In the struggle between the "exact scientist" and the believing

* Dr. Zoeckler in a Lecture, 1865.

theologian, the former generally prevails. Now that God has made all things and ordained for each one of them its place and motion, it would seem that as to these things He can no longer do as He will. Any supplement to matter and force already existing, every intermeddling with the order already established, and all interferences with the laws ordained must be *a priori* ruled out; for, we are told, all such doings would reflect discredit upon the alwise Creator and on the works of His hands. So far has this speculation been pushed, notably by *Schleiermacher*, that miracles in the proper sense of the term have been declared impossible. The notion that the Creator in His work should have completely bound His hands and put things beyond His control, is strangely thought a credit to divinity. Meanwhile, "Whatsoever the Lord pleased, that did He in heaven, and in earth, in the seas, and all deep places." Ps. 135, 6. As in the past so in the present and at all times our God does what He is pleased to do.

Also among the *supernaturalists* there are many who hold fast the notion of a universe absolutely complete within itself and in the same sense inviolable in all its parts and appointments, so that *contra naturam* nothing can take place. The ass is an animal complete without the gift of speech; therefore Balaam's ass never spake. The sun and moon are ordained to run each its course without steps; therefore the sun cannot have stood still upon Gibeon nor the moon have been stayed in the valley of Ajalon—not to mention here that such a sudden expenditure of force would have plunged the whole universe into rock and ruin as mechanics terrestrial and celestial can be made to show. The widow's barrel of meal must have wasted and her can of oil must have failed—that is in the nature of things and unalterably fixed. Whatever the good Lord may do, and if He do miracles as often He has done, never can it be allowed that He did anything contrary to His own doing. How very reasonable the proposition! No axehead ever did swim on the waters of Jordan, for that the specific gravity of iron is greater than that of water, that is by God's own doing and even He cannot do against the fact. Such conclusions are worse than foolish, they are blasphemous.

Whoever is not quite satisfied with what the flambeau of science has done to throw light on the subject under consideration perhaps may find what he wants under the wings of the owl. Philosophy, and speculative theology especially have concerned themselves a great deal about it, and not altogether without some rather positive results. Of course not! Here thinkers noted as the most profound investigators, free from all mental bias and in heart without all guile, have exerted themselves. These have about concluded that miracles are indeed very questionable things: their possibility is extremely doubtful and their reality may be safely disputed. What troubles them is, how to get rid of the Bible narratives on the matter. To accomplish this with a good grace and without making themselves liable to the charge of downright infidelity, many theories have been devised. The one tells us that these narratives are in fact so many allegories; another, that they are parables; a third, that they are largely interpolations; a fourth, they are overdrawn pictures of actual events; a fifth, misconceptions; a sixth, that they relate real events, but not such as belong to the physical world but such as have taken place in the religious experiences of the narrators;* a seventh holds them to be sacred mythologies, a kind of traditions originating in some strange bits of history and containing many germs of truth;† etc. Surely, the mind of man does not lack the power of invention.

To show what "science and philosophy" combined can manage to make of a miracle, attention is called to what their votaries have to say, for example, on the beginning of miracles which Jesus did in Cana of Galilee and where, as the Scriptures expressly tell us, the water was made wine. The medley is given on the authority of *Lange's Bibelwerk* and *Meyer's Kommentar*.

Explanation of the miracle: A nuptial jest. Jesus had a quantity of wine brought to the house and, having mixed it with the water, had the pots filled and placed on the table; thus *Paulus*; *Gfroerer*, and similarly *Ammon*, says that it was a wedding surprise on the part of Mary. *Strauss*: bitter waters made sweet, as in Exod. 15, 23, and 2 Kings 2, 19.

* So *Ritschl*.

† On *Herder's* suggestion.

Weisse: a parable misunderstood. *de Wette*: don't know what to make of it. *Bauer*: a symbol, representing that the time was at hand when Jesus as the true bridegroom should lead over from the waters of the preparatory position of John the Baptist to the wine of the higher messianic glory. *Chrysostom*, *Olshausen* and others: an accelerated natural process. *Neander*: a change of properties, pointing to the example of mineral springs having the taste of broth, of intoxicating wines, etc. *Scholten*: physically impossible because inconceivable. *Schweizer*: an interpolation. *Schenkel*: a story to be received *cum grano salis*. *Lange* himself: "the operation is therefore threefold: 1.) the creative placing of the wine in the contemplation of Christ imported to the guests sympathetically; 2.) an influence exerted on the participants through faith; 3.) an influence exerted on the element of drink itself." If this means anything it must be that the miracle related was wholly subjective, that is, a process brought about in the mind of the partakers and witnesses of it—some sort of a religious experience. *Meyer* boldly and nobly declares: "It is to be insisted on that this was a change of substance effected by the power Jesus has over the domain of nature according to a higher order of causality."

"I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty." Rev. 1, 8. "Great is our Lord, and of great power: His understanding is infinite." Ps. 147, 5. "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are His judgments, and his ways past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been His counsellor? or who hath first given to Him, and it shall be recompensed to him again? For of Him, and through Him, and to Him are all things: to whom be glory forever.—"To Him who *alone* doeth great wonders," Ps. 136, 4.—Amen." Rom. 11, 33-36. Such, as the Bible tells us, is our God. And while we are told that He doeth great things which are unsearchable (Job 5, 9), it is not forbidden us, but rather are we invited, to search the deep things of God. But this must be done, as only it can be rightly done, with His help, that is, in His fear and love and by the constant direction of His Word.

Grant it that science and philosophy can throw some light on the marvelous ways and works of God, the supercilious spirit in which it is done by so many must certainly be condemned. That before the almighty God the mass of matter and of force is invariably the same and the laws of nature can not be suspended nor broken, so that even He cannot create, destroy, provide and govern independent of and contrary to them—such are conclusions to which men are not entitled. It is the hight of presumption to extend and press to such extremes the lessons of our own imperfect observation and the laws of human and therefore limited and fallible logic. Nor will it do to plead in extenuation of such effusions that things are, as we think them to be, by God's own free decree: that, for example, had He pleased to do so He could have made the laws of nature, otherwise inviolable, breakable for Himself, but that such was not His will. But how do men know that the sovereign Lord of creation has so bound Himself? Where is it written in the Word and where is the proof of it in His works? On the contrary: both His words and His works testify that He is not so bound; that He does as He will, and that at times He wills to do and does what is *praeter*, and again what is *contra, naturam*.

"Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the Word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." Heb. 11, 3. As is the great miracle of creation, so are all miracles, objects not of sight but of faith. And whereas it is the boast of science that in its modus operandi it has discarded the element of faith as unscientific, in the name of its own brag-gardism it must let miracles alone. The science however which is willing to walk in humble subjection to the Word of God will confess that in all the things of God there is something too high for our understanding; and if this is the case in the natural, how much more in the supernatural. For this very reason, too, an adequate explanation of a miracle is impossible. They are doings of God which we can not understand. But this we know that, while in them He manifests His glory, they serve for the good of all who put their trust in Him and to whom all His ways are righteous and great and good.

C. H. L. S.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER IN
MODERN THEOLOGY.

*Reviewed and criticized by Dr. F. A. Philippi; tr. from the
Kirchliche Glaubenslehre of the author by G. H. S.*

CONTINUED.

In discussing the scriptural argument for the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper, we must above all things consider the question of a literal or a figurative interpretation of the words of institution. As is well known, efforts have been made to justify the latter in various ways. In the discussions on the Lord's Supper at the time of the Reformation, the words of institution $\tauοῦτοῦ ἐστι τὸ σῶμα μου$, which are found in exactly the same shape in the synoptic Gospels, Matt. 26, 26, Mark 14, 22, Luke 22, 19, cf. 1 Cor. 11, 24, the figure was sought for in the copula $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\iota$, and it was claimed that *is* here meant *to represent*. This interpretation, which in our day also is the most widely spread and popular view, must from the very start be declared as logically and hence also philologically impossible, so that only a stubborn dogmatic prejudice can explain its acceptance for so long a time. For *to be* and *to represent* are not only different but even contradictory terms. *To be* means that what is predicated of an object really exists; but *to represent* means that what is said of an object does *not* really exist, but only represents it and stands in such a relation to it as to represent it figuratively. Hence it would be as correct to claim that *to be* and *not to be* are identical as *to be* and *to represent*. Accordingly it has been found impossible to adduce the philological proof for this statement; for the usages of language never violate the principles of logic. All the seeming arguments that are adduced for this view have been refuted already by Luther, especially in his great confession concerning the Lord's Supper of 1528, and after him by many others. From one class of examples adduced it must be seen at once that it is impossible to identify *to be* and *to represent*, because the two cannot be used interchangeably. These are all those cases where the figure is found in the predicate. When Christ says, "I am the vine,

the light of the world, the way to the Father," it is impossible to change this into "I represent the vine, the light, the way;" but, as a matter of course, not the natural and terrestrial, but the spiritual, heavenly, proto-typical (urbildlich), true vine, way and light, ἡ ἀμπελος, ἡ ὁδός ἡ ἀληθινή, τὸ φος τὸ ἀληθινον. In another class of examples, *to be* and *to represent* can be interchanged, without however being identical in themselves. These are the cases where the figure lies in the subject. An example is found in the parable of the sower and the seed. When in the explanation we read δ σπόροσ ἐστίν δ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ Luke 8, 11, the subject, seed, is from the very start raised into the higher spiritual sphere. Here is meant the parabolical, the symbolical, the spiritual seed, which really *is* the Word of God—, for this is only another and figurative term for the Word, so that by means of the copula it is made identical with it. If, however, it had been said, "the seed *represents* the Word of God," then the seed of which the parable speaks would be considered as natural seed which merely represented the Word of God, but would not really be that Word, and of which it could just as little be said that the seed *is* the Word of God, as it would be said of the spiritual seed, that the seed *represents* the Word of God. Of the same character is the example of the cows, seen by Pharaoh in his dream, which is so frequently cited in this connection. To the class where the figure lies in the subject must also be counted that passage which the opponents of the real presence considered as of especial weight in determining the meaning of the word *ἐστι*. This passage is 1 Cor. 10, 5, ἡ δὲ πέτρα ἦν δ Χριστός. Since in the immediately preceding passage the πνευματικὴ πέτρα was spoken of, and the writer then continues with ἡ δὲ πέτρα this can mean in this connection only "this spiritual rock," but the stony rock in the desert "was not Christ, but merely pointed to Christ.

Hence under no circumstances can the figure be found in the copula, though it might be in the subject. The *τοῦτο*, according to the symbolical interpretation, is referred exclusively to the bread, and according to this view must be so referred. On the supposition that we have here a symbolical action, the bread could be considered as a substratum of the action. We would then have in the form of a visible process

an embodiment of the words of the Lord in John 6, that His flesh is the true bread of life. The Lord in taking, in the performance of a symbolical act, the bread and saying, This (bread) is my body, would by this very act transfer the bread from the low and physical to the higher and spiritual sphere, and thereby say, This bread as the visible and symbolical representation of the real and pure (urbildlich) bread of life, is my body. But then, in the first place, everybody would expect that from the very start it would be stated that a symbolical act was to be performed. Otherwise nobody could think of such a thing, when the Lord during a meal (*ἐσθίοντας* *ἀβρῶν* Matt. 26, 26, Mark 14, 22) takes bread from the table and gives it to the disciples and says, This (bread) is my body. Who, in passing a farmer sowing his seed, would say, This seed is the Word of God? It would be necessary from the start to announce, that no literal but a symbolical action was being performed, or an action would of itself have to be of such a character that, conceived as a natural action, it would be senseless and unthinkable, and therefore of itself show that it is symbolical; as, for instance, when a prophet with a sharp sword cuts his hair and beard, burns a third thereof with fire, scatters a second third with the sword, and throws the last third to the wind and ties up a little bit thereof in the ends of his cloak. Cf. Ezech. c. 5. For this reason the parables of the Gospels are introduced in such a manner, that from the very start there can be no doubt that we have before us not an actual but only a figurative transaction with a special meaning. In the same manner the apostle Paul, in interpreting the history of Hagar and Sarah in a typical sense, says Gal. 4, 24: Which things are an allegory, and then at once continues: For these are the two covenants, i. e. these two (allegorically understood) women are (just as such) two covenants, which actually as historical persons they *are not*, but only *represent*.

If the objection should be urged that sometimes a symbolical act is performed which from the very start cannot be recognized as such, but is only afterwards explained as such, as, e. g. the washing of the feet in John 13, it must be remembered that the Lord, as soon as the action as such becomes offensive to Peter, at once and then afterwards with unmis-

takable clearness, points out its symbolical character, cf. v. 8, 10-17. This unmistakable clearness could in no manner or shape be found in the words here in question $\tauὸντὸν ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου$, but rather the contrary. For when Christ at the table takes bread, breaks it, distributes it, and in doing so says, *This is*, then every hearer must understand this $\tauὸντὸν ἐστιν$ of that which is actually offered. But if *ex post* he was to be instructed through the predicate $τὸ σῶμά μου$, that here he was not to understand natural bread in itself, because natural bread could not be the body of Christ, but symbolically conceived bread, or bread in the spiritual sense of the word, he would of a necessity have been confused thereby and come into conflict with his previous conceptions and have been at sea, which confusion the following words, "This do in remembrance of me," would not have been able to remove, because in these he would at once again have thought of the taking, breaking and distribution of real bread. If the strength of the symbolical interpretation lies in these words, then they would not have been entirely omitted by Matthew and Mark, from which fact it appears certain that the real meaning of the words of institution is to be found alone in the $\tauὸντὸν ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου$. If the Lord should have desired to designate the taking, breaking and distribution of the bread really, and at the same time clearly and plainly as a symbolical act, He would have been compelled to reverse the subject and the predicate, and have said $τὸ σῶμά μου τὸντὸν ἐστιν$, or still more plainly $\tauὸντὸν τί ἐστιν$, or in order to make it perfectly clear $τὸ σῶμά μου δὲ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς ἐστιν δὲ ἀληθινός$, as he says John 6, 55, $\text{ἢ σάρκα μου ἀληθῶς ἐστιν βρῶσις}$. And this Swenkfeld very correctly felt when he, inverting subject and predicate, explained the words as follows: My body is *this*, or of such a kind, i. e. a spiritual food for souls,—which interpretation, of course, on account of the order of words and the structure of the sentence as now found, is grammatically impossible, as needs no further proof.

Since then the pretended figure can be found neither in the subject nor in the copula, attempts have been made to find it in the predicate of the words of institution. As is well known, Oecolampadius differed with Zwingli on this point that he did not take the word $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\omega$ in the sense of

represents, but *σῆμα* in the sense of *sign of the body*. Virtually the same is the meaning of Calvin with his *metonymia signati pro signo* (or *signi pro signato*). We must in this instance again deny the logical and actual, and hence also the philosophical, possibility of such a metonymy. A metonymy consists in the use of one word for another, because these words stand in a certain inner relation to each other. The exchange of meanings that thus takes place between the two is only permissible, because the one conception is contained in the other and is given with it, as also the objects whose names are interchanged stand in an inner, necessary and natural relation to each other and are indissolubly connected. Therefore we can indeed have a *metonymia causae pro effectu, antecedentis pro consequente, adjuncti pro subjecto, continentis pro contento*, but not a *metonymia signati pro signo*; and it is impossible that such a metonymy should exist, because the sign in most cases is merely an accidentally and arbitrarily selected object which of itself stands in no inner necessary and natural relation to the object which it signifies. Therefore, for instance, a person who plants an oak tree as a memorial sign of peace, cannot say, This oak is peace. When Samuel, 1 Sam. 7, 12, sets up a stone as a memorial sign of the victory of Israel and of the sheep of Jehovah, he could not say, This stone is the victory of Israel or is the help of Jehovah. When the Lord, Jud. 9, 36-40, designates the skin with and without dew as the sign of the wonderful omnipotence of grace, the skin itself could not be called the wonderful omnipotence of grace. When on the other hand, in Gen. 17, 9-13, circumcision is called both the covenant as also the sign of the covenant, these two have a different meaning. As an action circumcision is the covenant, as an actual consummation of the covenant, as the establishment of the covenant; it is the sign of the covenant as a physical condition, as the state of being circumcised, as the form given to the organ of generation as a consequence of this act or as its characteristic mark. When the miracles of Christ are called the *σημεῖα* of His divinity and Messianic character, they cannot, for that reason only, themselves be called the divinity and Messianic character of Jesus. Just as little, when bread is made the sign of the body, can we say, The bread is the

body. It is indeed true that the sign does not always stand in a purely outward and arbitrary relation to the thing signified, but it also may be the figurative expression corresponding to the object itself. Therefore Oecolampadius uses the idea of *sign* as equivalent with that of *picture*. But it was altogether out of place to bring in this connection the comparison of pictures or statues of real persons. To this Luther (*Bekennnis vom Abendmahl Christi* 1523, Erl. Ed. 30, p. 250 ff) has already given the correct answer. When, in speaking of a picture or a statue of a king, I say, This is the king, I mean thereby that it really is the king, i. e. the king painted in colors or cut out of stone; just as I say of a rose made out of wood or gold, This is a rose. But I mean something entirely different when I say, This is the picture or the statue of the king; for this signifies that it is not the actual and living king himself, but merely his picture or his statue. If we would endeavor to apply the word *picture* in this sense of bodily representation of a person or of a thing to the words of institution, this could be done only in the case that the bread would exhibit the plastic form and shape of the body of Christ; for then we could say, This is the body of Christ, but not in the sense that this is a picture of the body of Christ, but in the sense that this really is His body, i. e. His body baked of bread, made similar to His perfect body, His body of bread. But this is entirely out of question; and yet it is scarcely possible to speak otherwise of the picture of a body. On the other hand, an idea or abstract conception can, indeed, find expression in a corresponding bodily object and for that reason be identified with it. Thus it can be said of a queen who has a threefold diadem on her brow, that she carries three kingdoms on her brow. But this does not signify that she carries the sign or picture of three kingdoms on her brow, but that she actually carries three kingdoms on her brow, i. e. three kingdoms expressed in the *stereotype* and therefore everywhere recognized and understood picture of a diadem. In the same sense the Apostle says, 1 Cor. 11, 10, that every woman should have a power on her head, i. e. the power and supeemacy of the husband over her as expressed in the picture of the headcovering, whereby at the same time her subordination is expressed. For the Apostle had shown

in the preceding verses that an uncovered head signified freedom and independence, but a covered head dependence and servitude. If we would apply this to the body of Christ, notwithstanding that this is not an abstract but a concrete object, because this body can according to certain qualities, conditions and effects, be compared to bread, which then could in so far be regarded as a figurative embodiment of His body and accordingly could also be called the body itself that is represented figuratively in this way, even then the sentence, This is my body, would in no wise be identical with the sentence, This is my picture, and still less with the sentence, This is the sign of my body. But in that case the figure would lie not in the predicate, but in the subject, and to say, The bread is the body of Christ, would mean not the actual bread but the symbolical and figuratively conceived bread, the bread that has been raised to the sphere of the figurative is really the body of Christ. In this manner then we are again thrown back to finding the figure in the subject in the explanation of the words of institution, but the impossibility of this view we have already shown.

If then the figure can be neither in the subject nor in the object, nor in the copula, then this interpretation must be rejected and the literal interpretation adhered to. And this again Carlstadt very correctly perceived when he accepted at least the words, This is my body, in a literal sense, and attempted to derive the symbolical interpretation of the whole from the following words, This do in remembrance of me. In regard to his assertion that Christ in speaking the words, This is my body, had actually pointed to His body, and wherein he separates this sentence from the next with which it is grammatically connected, Luther had already given answer in his writings against the heavenly prophets. Erl. Ed. 29, p. 234 f. Nevertheless he preferred Carlstadt's literal interpretation of the words, This is my body, to the symbolical view of Zwingli and Oecolampadius. Thus he says in his words, *Das diese Worte etc. noch fest stehen.* Erl. Ed. 38, p. 40: "They concede that I have shown Carlstadt's view to have no good foundation. But if I were to judge between him and Zwingli, I would say that Carlstadt's view argues stronger for their error than Zwingli's trivial interpretation. Zwingli's treatment

is without any virtue whatever, as he attempts to make his point from pure *ignotis, incertis et particularibus*, which in the light of all reason is ridiculous and laughable. Dr. Oecolampadius tried to come to the rescue of such false views, etc."

Let us now further inquire wherein, in the symbolical interpretation of the words of institution the *tertium comparationis* is to lie. Some have found it in the breaking of the bread which corresponds to the breaking of the body of Christ on the cross. But this would necessarily have been stated, especially in an act so constituted, that it can be interpreted in many ways. Paul indeed says, 1 Cor. 11, 24, This is my body broken for you, and we are not willing, with a number of modern theologians, to take advantage of the fact that the word *κλάμενον* (broken) in this passage is critically doubtful, and to declare it a false reading because the bare *τὸ σῶμα τὸ διπερ δμῶν* appears too abrupt and scarcely intelligible. But Luke, who models his account after that of Paul, has *διδόμενον* (given) instead of *κλάμενον* (broken). He certainly then did not find the point of comparison in the breaking. But rather since in his account the *διδόμενον* corresponds to the *καὶ ἔδωκεν* (i. e. *τὸν ἄρτον*) *αὐτοῖς*, which immediately precedes it, we would be forced to believe that he saw the symbolical feature of the action in the giving and not in the breaking of the bread. Matthew and Mark have neither *κλάμενον* nor *διδόμενον*, but only *τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμα μου* with no addition whatever. For them then the breaking of the bread could surely not have been the essential feature nor the real point of comparison for the alleged purely symbolical act. If we believe with older theologians, that the exalted Lord, who, according to the Apostle's own assurance, had anew revealed to St. Paul the institution of the Lord's Supper (for the *ἔγώ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου* cannot, without doing violence to the word of God, be interpreted in any other manner), had given this revelation to him indeed in an essentially identical but yet in part enlarged and modified form, then He could not, in the original institution as recorded by Mark and Matthew, have used the words "broken for you," which He certainly would not have omitted, if He had considered them of essential importance. If, on the other hand, we say that the form in which the Apostle has these words, because the most complete, is also

the original, then we see that at least the authors of the synoptic gospels laid no stress upon the word "broken," and this fact is for us normative and decisive. And then the *κλάψενον* as used by Paul is only a figurative expression taken from the breaking of bread and applied to the body as though it were broken. The body that was slain was called "broken," in reference to the breaking of the bread which had just taken place; but the bread is not broken in a figurative sense, because the body had been actually broken. The latter did not take place and indeed could under no conditions take place, as in John 19, 36, it is clearly stated. All the more impossible is it therefore to base the symbolical interpretation on the breaking of the bread, because in this case the *signum* chosen would not at all correspond to the *signatum*. And then too the Lord could not have given the broken bread to His disciples to eat, but He would have been compelled to break it before their eyes and given the words of explanation, in reference to which we must yet remark that then the selection of bread and not of something else appears purely accidental. If everything depended upon the *breaking*, then any other fragile substance could have been selected. Furthermore, not only must the bread then not have been given to the disciples to eat, but merely have been broken before their eyes: doing which, however, it could not be said: This is my body which is broken for you—since everything depended not on the entirely meaningless bread itself but upon the very significant breaking of the bread—; but what must have been said, is: *οὕτως κλασθήσεται τό σῶμά μου* (This my body will be broken for you.) In a similar manner the prophet Hananiah takes the yoke from the neck of the prophet Jeremiah, and breaks it with the words: Even thus will I break the yoke of Nebucadnezer, King of Babylon, Jer. 23, 10. 11.

If finally, the symbolical feature were to be found in the act of breaking, it must, correspondingly, be found also in the act of pouring out. But the Scriptures speak indeed of the pouring out (shedding) of the blood, but never of the pouring out of the wine, and it is purely arbitrary to say that the wine had been previously poured out of a larger vessel into the cup. Even supposing that this had been the case, it was necessary, if a symbolical meaning was to be attached to this, to report

this expressly; it could not have been passed over in silence. And then the pouring out, or rather the pouring in of the wine into the cup out of a larger vessel, is not a pouring away or a spilling, as the blood of the Lord is really poured away and is spilt. In this case it would have been necessary rather to pour the wine upon the ground as a libation, and this with the words: *Thus my blood will be spilt.* Hence, as in the breaking the *signum* has no *signatum*, so in the pouring out the *signatum* has no *signum*. The pretended symbolism of the breaking and the pouring out thus amounts to nothing, and it is a comparison that not only limps, but rather one both of whose legs are broken. The breaking then did not take place for the purpose of symbolizing the body, but for the purpose of distributing the bread, and therefore must be looked upon as unessential and not necessarily repeated in the celebration of the Lord's Supper.

But if the breaking is not symbolical, then perhaps it is the taking and eating, which symbolically might represent the spiritual reception and partaking of the body of Christ. But of this too, not a word is anywhere said. The symbolism of the breaking has in the *χλώμενον* at least a seeming, although fragile and untenable support; but the symbolism of the eating is absolutely a pure fiction. In the words added, Do this in remembrance of me, the explanation and interpretation sought for in reference to the spiritual eating cannot be found. Either the Lord did not originally add these words, since Matthew and Mark do not have them, and then this standpoint loses its whole foundation; or else He originally added them; but then Matthew and Mark would not have omitted them, if just in them the ground for the symbolical interpretation was to be found. Neither can, in the sense in which it is claimed, this interpretation be found in these words. For the expression, "Do this in remembrance of me," according to the figurative interpretation of the words of the institution of the *Lord's Supper* and in harmony with the preceding actions and words, could mean only this, Break and eat the bread and drink the wine, and in doing so remember my body broken for you and my blood shed for you. But that this remembering is itself a spiritual eating and drinking of the body and blood corresponding to the bodily eating and

drinking of the bread and wine does not at all lie in the words, but is arbitrarily put into them. Besides it is to be supposed that the Lord would not only have demanded the spiritual eating and drinking itself, but above all would also have announced the purpose and the effect thereof. We eat bread in order to nourish our body, and we drink wine in order to strengthen and refresh ourselves. If then the symbolism lies in the eating and the drinking, then the effects of spiritual nourishment and sustenance could not have been passed over in silence. For spiritually the body of Christ is taken only as food for eternal life, just as bread is taken bodily for the nourishment and maintenance of the bodily life. Thus the Lord, John 6, 54, says: "Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up on the last day," cf. v. 58. "He that eateth of this bread shall live forever." In the words of institution the atonement and the forgiveness of sin are indeed mentioned, but not eternal life, and yet the bread that is eaten can correctly, on account of its effects, be called a picture of the bread of life, but not a picture of the forgiveness of sin. Since then the symbolical feature can lie neither in the breaking nor in the eating and partaking, it can also not lie in the combination of these two features. Hence we cannot explain it in this way: The bread which is broken, and which as food maintains the body, is a picture of the body which is broken, and taken spiritually gives eternal life. For then the words would have been, "My body which is broken for you is the true bread of life."

HOMILETICAL DEPARTMENT.

HOMILETICAL RULES.

From J. A. Quenstedt's *Ethica Pastoralis*, Translated from the German
by Rev. M. R. Walter.

VI. *The basis of the introduction should be either a commendation of the text, or a delineation of the context of the same, or a treatment of any subject which embraces the scope and theme of the sermon; but it should not be far-fetched, affected, pompous, abrupt, trite; nor so general as to be applicable to any other sermon.*

“Not every introduction is suitable for every sermon,” most correctly remarks Lud. Granateneis, Lib IV. De ratione conc. c. 2; therefore, the introduction should be composed with critical care. The introduction should, as much as possible, harmonize with the contents and scope of the text and be adapted to it, so that the preacher begin not with fishes and end with birds. With this understanding the basis of it may be either a commendation of the subject to be considered, or a delineation of the text together with its context, or the occasion calling forth the sermon, or the circumstances of the time, place or of persons. Dr. Carpzov says: Hodeget. membr. 2 aphor. 1 § 3 and 4;—“Although the subject itself should not be the basis of the introduction, nevertheless one should always begin with that which stands in relation to the contents and context of the subject. Especially do introductions derive force and acceptableness from the observance of the following: 1. Praising and commending the text under consideration; 2. Regard to the time and place, when and where we are to preach. 3. Sentences (propositions) of more general import, as of historical facts, or of promise, or of comment, or of threatening, may be expressed, so that from the general to the particular, from the genus to the species, from the prophecies and promises to their fulfillment and substantiation, etc., and in this manner pass over to the purport of the text.” (The sainted Gerhard says in his method. stud. theol.

p. 226: "Attention is aroused in the hearers, when in expounding a New Testament text a typical narrative or some prophetical passage from the Old Testament is employed as the basis of the introduction.") 4. If the sermon be treated according to the analytical method, then for the basis of the introduction it would be better to follow the delineation of the context of the text, or to recapitulate the divisions of the sermon previously delivered, or to utilize a parallel text; if the synthetical method be the mode of treatment it would not be out of place to give as introduction a paraphrase or a summary exposition of the text. Dr. Chemnitz in his meth. conc. p. 201 expresses himself about the same way: "The best way to compose an introduction is this; that a proposition containing the general import be presented and treated in a concise and consistent manner and finally in a proper course pass over to the subject of the sermon, as the genus to the species." Thus the introduction must stand in close connection with and in direct relation to the theme and not, that at first it be isolated by propositions altogether foreign to the subject so that finally with much difficulty it must be connected with the theme.

When a whole book of the Bible is to be expounded in a series of sermons, the introduction may take the place of a transition in which is briefly stated what has been said in the preceding sermon and what will be spoken of in the discourse to be delivered, and thus showing how the text under consideration is related to the one preceding it. Introductions of this class are called—"Exordia metabatica"—transitive introductions. This method was employed by Chrysostom in his homilies. For example, he says in his tenth homily on Genesis: "Respecting the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, I spake unto you yesterday. I instructed you, Beloved, concerning the various reasons why that tree was designated the tree of knowledge of good and evil. It is my object to day to pass on and treat of the fall of Adam." The fathers made use of such transitions whenever their sermons were closely related, or whenever they expounded in discourses whole books of the Bible.

Sometimes Chrysostom began his introductions by praising the audience, lauding the large attendance of those to

whom it is a gratification and pleasure to receive the divine truth. See hom. II. in c. 6 Is. and Gen. 54. Augustine in one of his introductions lauds the large attendance and the zeal of his hearers, as he in Tract VII. in John c. 1 says: "We all rejoice in the great number of you assembling here, because you have come together here more eagerly than we had even expected. This is, therefore, the cause of our joy, and it consoles us in all the cares and dangers of this life, namely your love to God, your pious zeal, your sure hope, and the fervor of your souls." Basilius once began his introduction by reproaching his hearers; he said that he was weary of preaching and much discouraged, because he had observed how the people after so many admonitions, immediately following the Quadragesimae fast and the divine service even on Easter, hasten to profane theaters, decking themselves with finery and revelling in debauchery. Examples of this style are also found in Holy Scriptures e. g. Is. 1. 1; Luke 3. 7.

From whatever source the introduction may be drawn it should always be observed that it be: 1. Short and consistent so that we do not at the beginning blunt the hearer's attention which we desire to sharpen by the introduction; 2. Suitable, and covering the scope of the sermon, so that that which should be looked for in the sermon may already be seen at the threshold; 3. Not too general, so as to be suitable to any number of sermons; 4. Not too remote nor too far-fetched; in which matter it would be well to heed Alstedt's rule: "The introduction should not be isolated from the theme nor made identical with the theme, but only be related to it in a certain degree." "The pulpit orator should be on his guard," says Wolzogen, *Orat. s. lib. II*, c. 41., "that he fall not into the error of those who make their introductions so complicated that they appear to have emerged from a labyrinth, while the hearers are unable to tell where the introduction will finally lead."

Neither should the close of the introduction and the transition to the theme be sudden or abrupt, as for example the following: "But enough of this; we will now proceed to explain the text." Such an introduction can be used to introduce any sermon that might be chosen, and then the sermon would be peculiar rather than the introduction. After

proceeding step by step and presenting by degrees, in the introduction, the character of the theme according to its application in the sermon the question or subject should be discussed.

The introduction should be delivered mildly, deliberately and to a certain extent softly, not too loud, nor in an impassionate voice, for the speaker should become animated only in the course of the sermon. Pathos is suitable for the climaxes in the sermon and the conclusion, but passionless address for introductions. See 1 Cor. 1, 10; 11, 2. . . . Thus we find that animated, impassionate and terse introductions have their justification; see Deut. 321; Is. 1, 1; 1 Cor. 4, 21.

At the close of the introduction the Church Fathers used to invite the attention of their hearers to the discourse following, as is shown by Chrysostom's hom. on Ps. 117. This is frequently practiced by our ministers.

At times the preacher can omit the introduction altogether, immediately present the theme and divisions, that is, if the subject which is under consideration is of such a nature that in itself it calls forth the attention and observation of the hearers, and imbues them with love and interest for itself; or when preceded by sermons on the same topics, as for instance, during Lent; or when the subject is to be fully and minutely treated; or for want of time; or, when a long text is to be explained in full; or, finally, when the speaker is physically indisposed. Christ Himself did not always use introductions, as we see from His sermons. The sainted Dr. Luther followed this example, for he preached not a few sermons without introductions, but opened with the subject he wished to discuss.

THE COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

This Magazine is designed to supply the want, long since felt, of a Lutheran periodical devoted to theological discussion. Its aim will be the exposition and defence of the doctrines of the Church as confessed in the Book of Concord. Theology in all its departments is embraced within its scope, though for the present special attention will be given to the controverted subject of predestination.

1. The Magazine is published bi-monthly, each number containing 64 pages.

2. The terms are \$2.00 per annum, payable in advance, which includes postage. Single numbers 35 cents.

3. All remittances should be addressed to J. L. Trauger, Agent, Columbus, O. All Communications pertaining to the Editorial Department to Prof. M. Loy, Columbus, O.

The friends of the Magazine are requested to give such aid in its circulation as their circumstances permit.

CONTENTS OF No. V.

	PAGE.
1. THE WILL IN CONVERSION, by Prof. M. Loy.....	257
2. MIRACLES, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette.....	295
3. THE DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER IN MODERN THEOLOGY, by Dr. G. H. Schodde.....	306
4. HOMILETICAL DEPARTMENT	317

Monies Received for Volume V.

Rev. F. Kuegele, Rev. S. Braaten, each \$3.00, Rev. J. O. Miller \$5.00,
J. P. Heinz \$5.66, J. Keck, Rev. J. Kucher, each \$6.00, Rev. W. F. Helle,
Rev. A. Rader, R. Lenski, each \$4.00, Rev. C. H. Althoff, Rev. H. Doerman,
F. W. Loewenstein, Rev. L. H. Schuh, Rev. S. Yunderson, Rev. J. J. Weiss,
each \$2.00, C. C. Hein, S. P. Long, each \$1.00.

C O L U M B U S

THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

A BI-MONTHLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF
THE EV. LUTHERAN CHURCH.

EDITED BY THE FACULTY OF CAPITAL UNIVERSITY.

VOL. V.—No. VI.

DECEMBER, 1885.

COLUMBUS, OHIO:
LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN OF THE OHIO SYNOD.
1885.

T H E

COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

VOL. V.

DECEMBER, 1885.

No. 6.

SOME OBJECTIONS TO THE DOCTRINE OF INSPIRATION ANSWERED.

That one person can communicate his thoughts to another and that the latter is able to reproduce and transmit verbatim what has been communicated to him, is well known; for it is a matter of daily occurrence. Now reasoning from the less to the greater, in this case from the power of the creature to the power of the Creator, it might seem strange that the power of God to speak to men and to cause them to repeat what they have heard, should ever be questioned, so that the mere

POSSIBILITY OF INSPIRATION

commands the place of a paragraph in Christian dogmatics. And yet the question as urged presents some difficulties which, though they may be more apparent than real, it is necessary to remove. Then, aside from this, the answer to it will be found instructive in other directions of theological research.

It is said, and with truth, that God, the Speaker in the problem, and the things spoken are infinite; but that man, the presumptive hearer, is a finite being. From these facts in the premises some would have us to conclude that, even if God were to reveal Himself and things divine, such revelation on account of its infinite character could not be received by the human intellect because of its finite nature. Others, not going to such extremes, would have us to infer that such weighty matters, when communicated to man, can be re-

ceived only with very great imperfection and that therefore also his reproduction and transmission of them must be imperfect in an equal if not greater measure.

Heard for the first time, the objections thus stated might impress one as the result of sound thinking; yea, as the effusions of an humble, not to say a pious, heart. But when we observe that those who here so readily acknowledge, and put such great stress upon, the imperfections and frailties of our common nature are the very persons who at other times and for other purposes, exalt humanity beyond the skies and place it on the throne of God—then have we every reason to suspect the sincerity of the humble professions made in the matter before us; and this all the more, seeing that their object is to deprive us of the “sure word of prophecy” by questioning the very possibility of it.

Nor are their minds a whit more sound than their hearts are humble; for of their logical weakness we are assured by the facts in the case, be we able to detect and expose it or not. The infinite, they say, cannot enter and be received by the finite—no more than a cubic foot of matter can enter and occupy the space of a cubic inch. By this is meant, speaking to the point aimed at, that God cannot make Himself known to, and be known by, man. That there is an ingredient of truth mixed in with the statement makes it all the more specious, as does also the insidious form in which it is generally cast. If a distinction were made between knowledge that is full and exhaustive and knowledge that is limited yet perfect in its limits, and then, in keeping with this distinction, were the possibility of an absolutely full knowledge of God denied, but of an incomplete yet copious and all-sufficient knowledge of Him admitted, and thus a laudable effort made to separate the truth from the error—then were there little left in the statement so amended for Christians to quarrel about. Teaching and learning on the one hand, and the transposition of things from space to space on the other hand, are by no means admissible comparates. Nevertheless it may be remarked that the cubic inch of space can at least embrace one of the 1728 solids; and more than that: by reason of the compressibility of matter, our little vessel may be made to receive within its dimensions a bulk a thousand times greater

than itself. Appearances are deceptive, especially at first sight; and history has repeatedly taught that propositions at one time looked upon as axiomatic, were in reality nothing but fallacies in truth's disguise.

That the theory before us, however, has more the appearance than the reality of truth, it is not difficult to show. Mind and matter are entirely different entities,—a fact which those must admit who would fix an impassable gulf, as it were, between God and man. Matter of itself and as such can neither think and speak, nor can it comprehend what is thought and hear what is spoken. And yet it is a palpable mistake to infer from the given facts that matter can in no way be made the receptacle and bearer of thought and speech. Three centuries after its execution our minds to-day may read from a picture of the Lord's Supper by *Leonardo da Vinci* what the mind of that artist thought and felt with respect to the characters, the appearances, the attitudes, etc., respectively of the good Master and His disciples when they celebrated for the last time the passover of the old, and for the first time the passover of the new covenant. Now while the canvas and paint of the picture can neither think nor speak, yet have they been made to think and speak in some manner, that is: one mind has here impressed upon matter *forms* of thought and speech from which *forms* other minds can read the thoughts and feelings of their author. In a manner similar, we may say, though with much greater perfection has the Creator of all things stamped upon these the evidence that He is, and does He declare by them, in part at least, who He is and what is His will toward us. "For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead; so that they"—the godless—"are without excuse." Rom. 1, 20. "The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth His handy work." Ps. 19, 1. Thus are finite things made to serve as the vehicle and voice of infinite realities. Not so, however, that God Himself were enclosed in the things of His creation, or that His own personal substance so pervaded them that either were a constituent part of the other, as pantheists would have it; but so that He is operative in and

through them, and thus becomes manifest through them as through means, and in which use these means are passive and suffer no change whether quantitative or essential. He indeed fills heaven and earth with His presence—Jer. 23, 23-24; etc.—; He is over all, in all and through all things, yet does nothing partake essentially of His substance.

As are earthly things so is human language, and this especially, made to receive and convey divine knowledge. Language is the form in which the mind clothes its thoughts and in which, by the instrumentality of the tongue, it gives utterance to them. Conceiving of thought as the spirit, language is the body in which the thought-spirit lives and moves and has his being. But language is human and therefore finite. And yet the infinite God has made it possible to reveal Himself and to speak to us through the thousand and ten thousand little words which in some orderly array constitute it. True, there is no one word and no number of words which can fully express all that God is. In Genesis, c. 3, we read that the great God Himself wrestled, as it were, with the difficulty of finding a name that might clearly set forth the nature and majesty of His Being. It is not found; and He simply says, "*I Am That I Am!*" and thus more is said than mind of man or of angel is able to encompass and ever can search out. Accordingly the Scriptures say: Great is the Lord, and greatly to be praised; and His greatness is unsearchable. Ps. 145, 3. Likewise they tell us of God's unspeakable Gift, 2 Cor. 9, 15; of the Spirit's groanings which cannot be uttered, Rom. 8, 26; of joy unspeakable and full of glory, 1 Peter 1, 8; and even of unspeakable words, 2 Cor. 12, 4.

But notwithstanding the inadequacy of the words of men to give an absolutely full and clear expression to the entire perfections of the Deity and to all the thoughts and works and gifts of God, yet do they serve Him to give perfect though limited knowledge to us both of Himself and of things divine. And so nearly boundless is the measure of knowledge laid down for us by means of such words, that to this day the length and breadth and depth of it are not ascertained, though countless thousands, and these led by the Spirit of Truth Himself, have been busy in the search.

When therefore we say that the knowledge of God as revealed to us and especially in so far as it is received by us, is limited, we say this with reference to its immeasurable fulness, that fulness in which the omniscient God Himself sees it: with respect to our own capabilities and needs, it is transcendently immense. Since God then has been able to reveal Himself and spiritual truth by means of earthly things, and notably through the words of men, in such an exceeding great measure, it certainly follows that the finite nature of our minds cannot hinder Him from making us understand whatsoever He has revealed, and has revealed for this very purpose. Surely the human mind is by many degrees nearer to the infinite than are the inanimate and irrational things of creation, and than is any language of its own creation.

Another observation is in place here; we mean what may be termed the elasticity of words and phrases. These are not such rigid things as that their import is necessarily always the same. The words *Christus Jesus*, for example, according to their etymology and apart from their history, simply designate an anointed savior. But when the Scriptures apply them to the Son of Mary, and tell us in other words that God Himself has anointed this Son of David with the oil of gladness without measure, that in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, that in none other there is salvation, but that in Him there is salvation for all the world—then do we learn that there is no wisdom, no power, no virtue, no grace, no comfort, no peace, no blessing, no glory, be it in heaven or in earth, but what are found in this same Godman, and therefore also in the name given Him. However, it is only when the light of the Scriptures generally is made to fall on it and God Himself opens our eyes, that we see what He has enclosed for us in the name which is above every name, even Christ Jesus. And while we look, and however much we may see, we are sensible of the fact that never have we seen all. Christ Jesus is the Central Sun of all Scriptural light, and too bright for our eyes to look into; therefore is this light from heaven diffused, as it were, and cast into thousands of little word-lights so that by these our vision may be enabled to behold Him who is

"the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world."*

The knowledge which God in this manner gives us of Himself and His Christ is perfect. The spirit of man can know Him who gave it. To this end was it created. We do know the true God, and we know Him truly, whatever men in their mock-humility and self-conceit may say to the contrary notwithstanding. That this knowledge is an all-penetrating and all-comprehensive understanding of its sublime object, is not the claim; nor is this a claim put forth by the Scriptural doctrine of inspiration. "For we know in part, and we prophesy in part." So we confess with St. Paul. But with this same man of God we also share the certain hope that "that which is in part shall be done away," and that "then we shall know even as also we are known." 1 Cor. 13. No, thanks be to God! we are not doomed to an everlasting yearning and searching for God and His truth, all in vain, as some would make us believe. Nearer to the truth are those who teach that we shall always learn, and that in such learning we shall evermore come nearer to God, as do the lengthening curves to its asymptotes; and yet as these in their infinite approach never meet, no more shall we ever be God's equals in knowledge. Nevertheless, what a pleasing and blissful prospect: God always the Master and we the pupils; He always teaching, we ever learning; all to His glory, and all to our salvation! This all godly students of the Word realize, and realize all the more the farther they prosecute their studies of it. So *Luther* testifies: "To fathom or approximately to exhaust the meaning of a simple word of the Scriptures, is simply impossible, in defiance of all the learned and theologians be it said. For the words of the Scriptures are the words of the Holy Ghost; therefore they are too high for man; new-born Christians have but the first-fruits, and that not a tithe of it. I have several times essayed to search out somewhat the ten commandments; but when I came to the first words, "I am the Lord thy God," I found it impossible to get beyond the first word, so that to this day I understand not the little word "I." Erl. Ed. Vol. 57, p. 13.

* Also from this point of view we learn a) that Scripture is to be interpreted by Scripture; b) that things which are the most familiar to the Christian student are at the same time also the most profound.

The testimony of the written Word concerning itself may be given in general in the words of Paul, 2 Tim. 3, 16:

ALL SCRIPTURE IS GIVEN BY INSPIRATION OF GOD;

or, more particularly in the words of Peter, II. c. 1, v. 21. "holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." Concerning the nature and extent of this divine process in men and through their agency, as also of its product, there has been much earnest inquiry and not a little speculation ever since the Bible has been given to the world.

Of the earlier church-fathers it may be said that they believed, what has since been termed, the *real* and *verbal* inspiration of the sacred writings. This is especially evident from their reverent use of the Scriptures. From these in things spiritual they professedly derived all their knowledge; they reasoned from them and appealed to them as an infallible authority. Occasionally, too, substantial expression is given to this really correct presumption. *Justin Martyr* in his *Hortatory to the Greeks*, says: "Our progenitors"—i. e. the writers of the Scriptures—"... have taught us nothing from their own private fancy, nor differed with one another, nor attempted to overturn one another's positions, but without wrangling and contention received from God the knowledge which also they taught to us. For neither by nature nor by human conception is it possible for men to know things so great and divine, but by the gift which then descended from above upon the holy men, who had no need of rhetorical art, nor of uttering anything in a contentious or quarrelsome manner, but to present themselves pure to the energy of the divine Spirit, in order that the divine plectrum itself, descending from heaven, and using righteous men as an instrument like a harp or lyre,* might reveal to us the knowledge

* The lofty animadversions by modern rationalistic theologians on the use of such figures, among the fathers and the dogmaticians of our own church, are wholly gratuitous. It certainly has not entered the mind of anyone employing such figures, that the inspired Prophets and Apostles ceased to be men by reason of such inspiration and that they were not sensible of what they thought and spoke when moved by the Holy Ghost. A bad cause is his who resorts to stretching the figures of an opponent.

of things divine and heavenly. Wherefore, as if with one mouth and one tongue, they have in succession, and in harmony with one another, taught us both concerning God, and the creation of the world, and the formation of man, and concerning the immortality of the human soul, and the judgment which is to be after this life, and concerning all things which it is needful for us to know, and thus in divers times and places have afforded us the divine instruction." Cap. 8. Comp. his *I Apol.* cap. 36. † Similarly *Athenagoras the Athenian* in his *Plea for the Christians* says: ". . . the prophets . . . lifted in ecstasy above the natural operations of their minds by the impulses of the divine Spirit, uttered the things with which they were inspired, the Spirit making use of them, as a flute-player breathes into a flute." Cap. 9. "Look carefully into the *Scriptures*"—writes *Clement* to the *Corinthians*—"which are the true utterances of the Holy Spirit. Observe that nothing of an unjust or counterfeit character is written in them." I *Ep.* cap. 45. "We offer proof"—says *Tertullian*—"that they (the *Script.*) are divine . . . they (the unfulfilled as well as fulfilled prophecies) are uttered by the same voices, they are written in the same books . . . the same Spirit inspired them." *Apol.* cap. 20. And *Irenaeus*, coming down to the point of words, writes: "Matthew might certainly have said, 'Now the birth of *Jesus* was on this wise;'" but the Holy Ghost, foreseeing the corrupters (of the truth), and guarding by anticipation against their deceit, says by Matthew, 'But the birth of *Christ* was on this wise' . . ." Book III. cap. 16, § 2.*

Whatever of truth and of error may have been taught between that time and our own, with this position of the ancient church on the doctrine of inspiration we find our own church in complete harmony. Notwithstanding the

† Tr. from the "*Ante-Nicene Fathers*;" (as are also the most of the following.) Am. Ed.

* When in conflict with such utterances *Theophilus* says that there were many prophets among the Hebrews, and then adds, "and also among the Greeks there are the Sibyl"—*ad Antolycus* Book II. cap. 9—it does not necessarily follow, a) that he himself substantially identified the oracles of God in the *Scriptures* and those of the Sibyl—he may have intended no more than a far-fetched analogy; b) that the notion of the fathers generally concerning the nature of divine inspiration was very vague.

fact that some few inconsistencies in his utterances on the subject have been ferreted out, and which some men delight, as it seems, to magnify and publish as much as possible, Luther beyond all doubt firmly believed the Bible to be inspired as to substance and form. Speaking of the Church or the kingdom of Christ, he says: "Not the decrees of the pope, not the Alkoran of the Turk, not the Talmud of the Jew, can teach us what it is. The sacred Scripture is the book which God the Holy Ghost has given His Church, and from this she must learn what she is, what she is to do, what to suffer, and where she is to abide. Where this book ends, there also ends the Church; for He (Christ) says: 'they know not the voice of strangers.' John 10, 5." Vol. 26, p. 100. "Every word of it is to be received in its natural sense, and in no way is this to be departed from unless faith"—i. e. the analogy of faith, or some clear passage of Scripture—"force one to do so." Vol. 33. p. 396. "No, the Scriptures do not contradict themselves; some may say so and think so, but they cannot prove it." Vol. 30. p. 51. "And if many thousands and more, yea all the holy teachers think this or think that, it all amounts to nothing when it stands opposed to one single passage of the Scriptures, as St. Paul says, Gal. 1, 8: But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed."*

That in the faith of Luther the Bible is throughout the Word of God, no one will for a moment doubt who is at all acquainted with his writings and with the spirit of the man. And such is at the same time the faith of the Church bearing his name. Though the doctrine of real and verbal inspiration is nowhere expressly set forth in her confessions, yet do these everywhere rest on this basal position, treating it as a matter of course and about which among true Christians there can be no dispute. Comp. however *Conf. Aug. Ed. Mueller*, p. 66, § 42: "Num frustra haec . . . ;" *Apol. Conf.*

* His one-time judgment on certain books of the Bible, often pointed to in order to detract from his high esteem of the Bible has nothing to do with the subject before us, except that it goes to show the strength of Luther's faith in divine inspiration. When once he believed a book to be a part of the Bible, he bowed in humble and glad submission to every word of it.

ib. p. 107, § 108: "Num arbitrantur . . . ;" *Art. Smal.* ib. p. 323, § 12: "Et Petrus inquit . . . ;" and finally the Introduction to the *Formula of Concord*. *Baier* defines: Divine inspiration is that act of God by which not only the conception of all things to be written, but also the conception of the words and of everything necessary to give proper expression to the things revealed, was supernaturally communicated to the intellect of the writers, and the will of the latter was moved to the act of writing.

Its full import, and especially its nicer and more implicit features, are perhaps best set forth by a notice of the negation which this doctrine has had to endure. An only, an absolutely pure and all-sufficient source of truth, an infallible authority and rule in all matters of the faith and life—such are things which in the estimation of proud reason are not a priceless boon, but an intolerable rebuke and restraint. It is therefore not at all surprising that all sorts of exceptions have been taken, even within the Church, against the doctrine as enunciated. One D.D. has offered this modification to it, a second another.

Foremost among the objections advanced is *the sinful nature of man*. Not infrequently is this coupled with the argument based on his finite nature, and then together with this urged against man's capability of receiving any divine revelation whatever. Properly viewed however this only goes to establish what St. Peter says; to wit, "that no prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation" and "that the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man." In no wise can it disprove, (nay, it even suggests the necessity of it,) that "holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." Sin is but an accident of our common nature; it is removable, and with it the scales are removable which sin has cast over the eyes of mind and heart. It is written, and men in all ages have realized the truth of it, that "where sin abounded, grace did much more abound." Rom. 5, 20. Nevertheless, if it pleased almighty God so to do, no doubt He might mediate the knowledge of His will even through ignorant and wicked men; comp. John 11, 49-52. Be that as it may, such is not the claim put forth, but rather, that "holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

It is true, however, that perfect holiness cannot be ascribed to the inspired writers. It may be conceded that they could err and sin, and that at times they did. (Gal. 2, 11 etc.) Yet this is not the question. The controverted point is whether their fallibility as men extends over them as writers, so that in this latter capacity they were liable to err and at times did err. This we deny. While receiving the oracles of God, they were moved by the Holy Ghost. Under this divine mastery, whatever may have been the particular nature of it and however exercised, all possible and real errors were excluded from what they spake, and what they did speak was truth. "For I delivered unto you first of all *that* which I also received," writes Paul to the Cor. 1. cap. 15, 3; and upon this holy assumption are the entire Scriptures addressed to men. That which they received of the Lord God, that—nothing beyond it, nothing different from it, nothing prejudicial to it, nothing opposed to it—they delivered to mankind. Once granting the truth of the above assumption, how can it be otherwise? Is it at all reasonable to suppose that men under the mighty influence of the holy God and in His employ, should want to impose upon others their own notions, not to say fictions, as the very truth of their divine Master, and that He should suffer them to do so; and if they did, that He should accredit them by signs and wonders as His special messengers? Notice how carefully St. Paul, for example, discriminates between that which he says as a Christian, (and as such too he had the Spirit of God, v. 40), and that which he says as the Word of the Lord. 1 Cor. 7, 12. In so far as the writers of the Bible were simply men and Christians such as we are, no doubt some of the imperfections attached to them which are common to us all; and this they were free to confess, as witness 1 John 1, 8. 1 Tim. 1, 15, etc. But under the miraculous movement of the Holy Ghost, that is, as men inspired, and when thus inspired they spake in the name of the Lord, all such obstacles in their nature were completely overcome and rendered ineffectiive. Moses plead slowness of tongue and speech, and Samuel his fear of Saul; Jeremiah would have interposed his great youth when first called, and in after years bitterly deplored the hardness of his lot; Jonah sought to escape the Lord by tak-

ing ship, being reluctant to serve; even the great Peter was blinded by old Jewish notions, so that he would not go to the Gentiles—but all these hindrances were removed by the breath of the Lord, and frail men were made His faithful ambassadors.

Another, and in the eyes of most people the weightiest objection to our doctrine of inspiration, is the alleged contradiction of the Bible in part with its own statements and in part with such facts as have come to the knowledge of men from other sources. Apparent discrepancies in its utterances have obtruded themselves on the notice of Bible-students from the earliest times to the present. Thus Origen, for example, a staunch believer in the inspiration of the Scriptures down to the letter, as he seems to have been, acknowledges himself unable to harmonize the records respectively of St. Matthew (c. 26) and of St. John (c. 12) as to the Lord's last appearance in Bethany and the events connected with it; and he expresses his belief that no one would ever succeed in establishing harmony here. But long since has it been shown that his belief and trouble both were groundless. See *J. P. Lange's Bibelwerk* Vol. I. p. 371-372 and his tr. and com. on Matt. 26, 1-6. Such is the history of many "incongruities," whether they pertain to the letter or to the spirit of the good book. The beam was found in the eye of the observer while the mote was nowhere. Much has been done already by way of removing difficulties of this kind; and our common Christian hope is that in time unbiased and prayerful scholarship will show that *Chrysostom* was right when he declared all the *enantiophonies* in the Scriptures to be but so many *enantiophonies*, that all the contradictions were in fact only apparent contradictions.

As to the conflict between science and the Bible it may here suffice to remark, that when once such hypotheses and theories as oppose the statements of the Bible have been shown to be facts, and this done, it be shown also that the Bible rightly interpreted is not in accord with such facts, then will the time have come to lower our banner, just a little. But that time is not now and, we firmly believe, never will be. The cosmology of Moses has withstood the brunt of ages; but of a cosmology by another that has survived a single age unimpaired, we know not.

Howbeit, the difficult and inviting problems thus presenting themselves, the desire to reconcile knowledge divinely revealed and knowledge humanly acquired, the love to penetrate into the mysterious, the duty to get understanding, the supreme importance of the subject itself—considerations and motives such as these, not to mention others not so pure, have urged men on to inquire more closely into the *positive* nature of that divine influence which has produced the books of the Bible. Their labors have resulted in several

THEORIES OF INSPIRATION

which are, as might be expected, more or less at variance among themselves.

As do the great objects of revelation—i. e. God Himself, His will and His works, etc.—so do God's speaking to men about these things and His recording of the words spoken, in a great measure lie beyond the powers of the human understanding. Inspiration, no less than revelation proper, is a miracle. Mortal man can have no full and clear knowledge of it. All that he can know about it must be told him from above; but what is thus said to him again largely eludes his mental grasp. At times the Lord Himself appeared to speak to men, hidden in the clouds or clad in flames, or assuming the form of man. Then again He would speak from heaven in the voice of man, or He would send His angels to communicate His messages. At other times He would address men in dreams, in visions and in trances brought about by Himself. Then, "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son . . . the brightness of His glory, and the express image of His person . . ." Heb. 1, 1. Then we read of the gracious outpouring of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, and of subsequent bestowals of this same extraordinary gift. Thus then "holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." And this impulse and motion in men, brought about in many ways but by the same Spirit, the Spirit of God, the Scriptures themselves call *theopneustia* or "inspiration

of God*—so that we have given to us not only the proper expression for the divine act under consideration but also much that is designative and explanatory of it. Here also belong John 14, 26: He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance ;” ib. 15, 26: “ He shall testify of me ;” ib. 16, 14: “ He shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you,” and v. 13: “ He will guide you into all truth.”

From all this we learn, not only that the Scriptures are from God and mediated through men, but that this communication of God consisted in speaking, in teaching, in reminding, in testifying, in showing, in guiding, and in moving holy men, filling them with His Spirit. Verily, information enough to satisfy every humble and devout mind.

But men would master also this miracle and mystery of God—and they approach it, alas, not always with such fear and love as should lead us on ground so holy. The exact mode of acquiring earthly knowledge is a riddle that still runs without a satisfactory solution ; dreams are things about which men cannot do much more than dream ; natural phenomena continue to puzzle the very wisest among them ; and yet men make bold to see through the operations of God in things spiritual ; and, of course, with many unhappy results.

The leading point of inquiry here, and of controversy at the same time, is : *to what extent is God active and is man passive in the process of inspiration.* The cry is, by some, that too little of the operation is ascribed to man ; by others, that too little is ascribed to God—there the pelagian, here the fatalistic school of theology. Errors, of course, lie in both directions ; but the greater safety is with the latter. Holy men spake ; but they were moved by the Holy Ghost. Speaking, did these men speak to any extent whatever what in substance was of themselves and not of God ; and again : did they have the choice of words and phrases, or were these

* θεόπνευστος (2 Tim. 3, 16) = literally, Gottgeahndt, Gottbegeistert = God-breathed, God-inspired. Here in the passive sense ; see Wiener's Gram. 5 ed. p. 108.

given them? Moved by the Holy Ghost, did they act automatically, as it were, or were they fully conscious and sensible of what they were led to do? Such are some of the questions involved. Their importance is obvious; for practically, and generally speaking, they amount to this: whether the Scriptures are the Word of God, or whether this is simply found in the Scriptures.

In the first place, in the postulate itself, that the Scriptures are the Word of God, there is nothing which of necessity precludes activity or co-operation of holy men when they serve God as media in the work of inspiration; nor is there any statement in the Bible itself which forbids such an assumption—always provided that the mere natural powers of man are not meant in the premises. Enlightened in intellect and sanctified in will as they were in an extraordinary and specific manner, why should these men not have understood what was communicated and willingly have delivered in its full integrity of substance and form what they had received, and throughout it all have been conscious of the nature of the service rendered? True, “we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard,” say Peter and John, (Acts 4, 20); and Paul confesses: “For though I preach the Gospel, I have nothing to glory of: for necessity is laid upon me; yea, wo is unto me, if I preach not the Gospel!” (1 Cor. 9, 16-17.) But this constraint and necessity was from within as much as from without; a constraint arising from their new nature as well as coming upon them from above. They must hear and see and speak and write in the sense in which the shrub must bloom and the tree bear fruit; they in the order of the spiritual, these in the order of the natural. Under the benign influence of the heavenly Light the sacred writers assimilated the spiritual substance they had received from God and were to deliver to men. “Son of man, eat that thou findest; eat this roll, and go speak to the house of Israel,” said the Lord to Ezekiel 3, 1. Comp. Rev. 10, 9-11. Matt. 4, 4. The notion that these men, themselves in need of and entitled to the truth they conveyed, should have acted as mere machines or in a somnambulistic state of mind, is preposterous. And it is unscriptural; for, when committing His Word to Ezekiel, the Lord expressly states: “Son of

man, all my words that I shall speak unto thee receive in thine heart, and hear with thine ears." Cap. 3, 10. This much of truth, however, we believe to be found on this side of the question, namely, that the sacred writers did not always understand in their utmost fulness the words they were moved to speak. For this belief the Scriptural warrant seems to be given us 1 Peter 1, 11, and, as shown above, 1 Cor. 13, etc.

In the second place, those theories which have emanated from that particular trend of thought, which is ever ready to do battle for the high dignity of poor persecuted humanity, seem to be much more rational; but at the same time they will be found all the more inimical to the good cause of the Scriptures. The arguments here adduced appear to be taken mostly from the Bible itself, when in reality they are the sputterings of reason which has taken offense at it. If there be a passage, a chapter, or a whole book even, which does not agree with some people's way of thinking or with their sense of right and wrong, of good and bad, they persuade themselves that such portions of the good book cannot be genuine, that is, not inspired. Indeed, a cheap way of believing and doing what one pleases, while at the same time professing subjection to God's Word. No wonder then that every effort is put forth to establish the convenient and liberal principle: the Word of God is here and there deposited in the words of Scripture.

The rationale by which the proof is attempted is not always the same. Some assert that only the substance of Bible truth was inspired—whether of all or only of part, on this point the doctors disagree. The substance being given, they say, it was left to the sacred writers to digest and develop it, and to mold it into proper expression—whether herein they had assistance from above, and if, what kind and to what extent: on that again the doctors are not agreed. It is argued by the adherents to this evolutional theory that God never does for man what man himself can do; that the truth, being communicated to him in its essential outlines, man can by the ordinary processes of logic and the laws of language do all that is necessary to write the Word of God and—note well the concession *and* the desideratum of the concessionist

at the same time—that if some error should creep in, they will not amount to much and men (i. e. we of the 19th century) will be able to detect and correct them. To this assertion, however, the plain fact is opposed that the mind of man is not such a masterly philosopher as set forth in the assumption. The absolute unity of truth is a principle commonly accepted. A denial, therefore, of any part of that truth, if consistently evolved and carried out, must eventually end in a denial of the whole truth. How then shall we account for the common fact that every man holds to be true at the same time things that are true and things that are not true? Or more particularly: how shall we account for it that in all ages men have erred in some points of Christian doctrine, and on some points only, that is, that they have lived and died as Christians in spite of the false doctrines which they have advocated? And this is not only true as regards the masses which concern themselves very little about the connection of truth with truth; no, it includes the best thinkers of the Church and the world. Certainly, the most satisfactory solution of the problem is, that the human mind is not the keen and unerring logician it is proclaimed to be. Then, when it is observed besides how very errant it proves itself in its speculations on things earthly, how very fallible must it be in things spiritual. No, if we are to have the Truth of God at all, the thousand truths which compose it must be given to us by God—as indeed they are given. “One is your Master, even Christ.” But He is no longer our Master, when we set up ourselves as the judges of His inspired message.

There are others who would not go to such length as do those advocating the theory in this shape. They would have it modified, maintaining that all those portions of the Bible are inspired which have an ethical or religious import. As a matter of fact, however, what is there in the Bible that were not ethical or religious either in itself or in its direct bearings? Throughout it speaks of the doings of God on the one hand, and on the other of the doings of beings responsible to Him: of beings, whether men or angels, good or bad. And as to such things as may seem to lie beyond the domain of the spiritual, what hight of presumption it is to forejudge that the great God, when writing the history of heaven and

of earth, so to speak, must by no means in the choice of His words and figures say anything which man might know or find out of himself! Thus would men in their wicked folly prescribe to the alwise God.

Another theory and one cut loose from the above, is that which, while it admits that the Scriptures are inspired as to their substance, deny it as to their form. The words and phrases employed are of men and chosen as best they knew how. Add to this, that the sacred writers did not always succeed in saying what should have been said,—be it from a want of understanding what had been revealed, or that their memory of it failed them, or that they lacked the necessary command of language—add this, we say, and you have the proposition in full. In support of it the Scriptures are arraigned against themselves.

First it is found that the several books of the Bible are written in the style of their respective authors, including not only their linguistic peculiarities but some linguistic improprieties as well. Be it so. And if it be, why should God, pleased as He was to clothe His Word in the language of men, not have pleased to put it in the language of the very individuals who were to be the bearers of it, even if their style was not quite classic? Commonly, His ways are not our ways. A soul the nearest after the heart of God may be called to dwell for a while in a body full of sores. There is no evidence that the only Begotten of the Father, when in the flesh He dwelt among us, was the fairest among men as men are wont to conceive of beauty. Likewise is the great heavenly treasure, the word of eternal truth and life, put in but poor earthen vessels, even when these are in their highest perfection possible. Besides an incorrect, not to say a somewhat vulgar, expression may now and then serve the chief purpose of language fully as well as any other. This we will prove right away—and thus with the promise of it is the proof furnished. On the other hand, much might be said, and has repeatedly been said by the highest authority in such matters, not only in defense but in praise of the language in which the Bible is written. But however men may judge of it, by its own statement the words of the Bible are inspired. Holy men, not only when they received the truth from God but

also when they spake the truth received, were moved by the Spirit of God. 2 Peter 1, 21. "And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." Acts 2, 4. Comp. Matt. 10, 19-20. "Behold, I have put my words in thy mouth." Jer. 1, 9. In the words of God's own selection was the Word of God given, received, spoken again and committed to writing.

Against this it is urged that the Bible contains not a few statements of such a trivial character and some so unchaste, and others so unjust and cruel in principle and feeling, that it were wrong to attribute them to the great and pure, the righteous and gracious Spirit of God. Well yes, the Bible does speak of many things, some infinitely great, others infinitely small; but the very least of them all may be a creature of God or some little deed teaching a needful lesson. So again, it does say something about some very filthy things; and among the filthiest of them all is a self-conceited, fastidious and sanctimonious heart. Were men to become more disgusted with this, many things, which to them now seem impure, might then appear quite clean. Lastly, as to your complaint of hard sayings: "Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to Him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus? Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honor, and another unto dishonor?" Such is God's own answer to all who would enter into judgment with Him on the justice of His works and ways; and in vain shall they look for another. The humble and God-fearing student, however, of such passages as Romans 9, Psalm 137, 7-9, etc., is sure to find that all God's works are done in truth and righteousness, and that God is love and holy withal.

Opposed to all such queries and quibbles as are intended to controvert the fact that the Bible is throughout in essence and form the very Word of God, stands its own clear testimony. Again and again our Lord and His Apostles refer to the Scriptures. And in so doing they employ the term not as a common noun, applicable to any writings whatsoever, but as a name designating specified writings and as such well known; namely, the books of the Old Testament. This is established beyond all doubt. Now in quoting the Scrip-

tures, they are invariably adduced and appealed to as the highest authority, as the Word of the Lord. Furthermore, not the slightest intimation is to be detected in such appeals to the Scripture anywhere, that anything therein were not true, or that a single word of it were not the Word of the Lord. On the contrary, He who is the Truth Himself declares that "the Scriptures cannot be broken," John 10, 35, and that "it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail." Luke 16, 17; and so when tempted of the devil, He offered no defense but the simple declaration: "It is written," and again, "It is written." See furthermore such testimony as given in Heb. 1, 1; Rom. 3, 2; Luke 1, 70; Matt. 1, 22 and 2, 15; Acts 1, 16; etc.

Since then the entire Old Testament is by the Son declared to be the Word of God, there can be no doubt about the character of the New. In its own words: "*All Scripture is given by inspiration of God.*" 2 Tim. 3, 16. Such is the faith and confession as it becomes all those who are "born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God, which liveth and abideth forever," 1 Peter 1, 23, and who in this new birth and life experience that the Word, by which they have been begotten, is all divine. As to the sceptical and the despisers of it, we say with Luther:

"The Word of God they shall let stand,
And not a thank have for it."

C. H. L. S.

CHRIST'S DESCENT INTO HELL.

BY REV. O. S. OGLESBY.

The Apostles' Creed is the earliest formal expression of the Christian faith outside of the written Word of God, and it is the head and embodiment of the confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church to-day. It is placed at the head of our confessions, first, because it is the oldest formal confession of the Christian faith, and secondly, because "it is a brief summary of all the chief articles of the Christian religion and faith."

It may properly be called the embodiment of the confessions of the Lutheran Church, inasmuch as all her other confessions are simply developments of what is contained in the Apostles' Creed.

It therefore behooves us, who recognize and acknowledge the confessions of the Lutheran Church as a correct expression of our own faith, to study well this Apostolic Symbol, that each one may be fully persuaded that our confessions do, *indeed*, conform with God's Word, as did the Bereans who searched the Scriptures daily, to know whether those things which Paul preached unto them were true or not. (Acts 17, 10-11.)

We should also diligently study this characteristic symbol, in the light of God's Word, that each one may be able to give a statement of, and ground for the faith he holds, for God declares that "Everyone of us shall give an account of himself to God," (Rom. 14, 12.) and He also admonishes us to "Be ready always to give answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you, with weakness and fear." (1 Peter 3, 15.)

In the second article of the Apostles' Creed we find confession is made of the belief that Christ descended into hell, expressed in the words, "He descended into hell," which words constitute an expression of our belief concerning the teachings of God's Word as recorded in the 1. Epistle of Peter 3, chapt. 18-19 verses.

No part of the Apostles' Creed has been more bitterly assailed than this sentence, and careful and prayerful study is required of its defenders.

In considering this subject we shall endeavor to determine, *First the person who descended*. To the question, Whom do we believe to have descended into hell? we will give an unequivocal and simple answer, one which all may understand and remember. We believe, confess and teach that *Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, our Lord, descended into hell, as God-man*, which answer is substantially found in the Form. of Conc. p. 704, N. Market Ed. The holy Scriptures clearly teach that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, begotten of the Father from eternity, and that He became flesh, i. e. man, and dwelt among us. This is tersely expressed in John 1, 1.

and 14. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, (and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth." Thus we learn that the second person of the Godhead became man, not that He ceased to be God, but that God united Himself with human nature, "was made in the likeness of men," or as Paul expresses the same truth, "God was manifest in the flesh." (1 Tim. 3, 16.)

In the holy Scriptures this God-man is called *Jesus*, so named by the angel, because He should save His people from their sins, and He is called *Christ*, or *Messiah*, that is, the Anointed, because He was anointed without measure, by the Holy Ghost, to be our Prophet, High Priest and King.

The purpose for which Jesus Christ, the God-man, came into the world, is expressly declared in Matt. 1, 21, "He shall save His people from their sins," and also in 1 Peter 3, 18, "To bring us to God," and again in 1 John 3, 8, "For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that He might destroy the works of the devil."

That Jesus Christ, the God-man, truly accomplished this work for which He came into the world, is declared in John 19, 38, "It is finished," which declaration God the Father confirmed, with power, by the resurrection of the Son from the dead, and the Holy Ghost testifies to its truthfulness in the words, "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us." (Gal. 3, 13.)

This infinite work was accomplished by Jesus Christ, the God-man, not by Christ as God alone, nor by Christ as man alone, but by the God-man, Jesus Christ, and this same God-man, Jesus Christ, the Conquerer of the devil, and Destroyer of the works of the devil, like a true conquering Hero, descended into Hell, the citadel of the conquered, and there proclaimed His victory over the conquered.

Therefore we teach that Jesus Christ, the God-man, descended into hell, not according to His divinity only, nor according to His humanity only, but according to *both His divinity and humanity*. It is this entire God-man of whom it is said in 1 Peter 3, 19, "He went and preached unto the spirits

in prison," and it is this entire God-man of whom confession is made in the second article of the Apostles' Creed.

There are those who teach that Christ descended into hell according to His divinity only, while according to His humanity He remained in the grave until the time of His appearance unto men.

This is a serious error. It is to teach the error that after the crucifixion, the union of the divine and human natures ceased to exist, that Jesus Christ, the *God-man*, ceased to be. It is the same error taught by all Protestant Churches, except the Lutheran Church, concerning Christ's presence upon earth, that He is present according to His divinity only, while according to His humanity He is restricted to a certain locality, viz. heaven.

This we reject as an error, *first*, because it tends to the destruction of all Christian faith, consolation and hope. It is to lay the axe at the root of Christian faith, it is to embitter the water of Christian consolation, and to take away the foundation of Christian hope, for it throws the mind into doubt and confusion concerning Christ, as to His existence, as to His presence, and as to His power.

In the God-man, Christ Jesus, the divinity and humanity are *inseperably* united. This union is an eternally enduring union. Since the first moment of the union of the divine and human natures in Christ, this union has *uninterruptedly* continued, and will so continue through the endless ages of eternity. Therefore, wherever the divinity of Christ is found the humanity of Christ is also found, whether it be in His descent into hell, or in His presence on earth, or in heaven.

That Christ descended into hell according to His divine nature only, we reject as an error, *secondly*, because the act of descent cannot be attributed to the divine nature strictly speaking, for according to His divine nature He fills all places, and was, therefore, in hell before His incarnation, filling all places with His dominion. See Schmidt's Dogmat. p. 396 and 412. (28. Quen.)

Strictly speaking the act of descent could be attributed to the human nature only, but inasmuch as by virtue of the most intimate union of the two natures, both natures are said to take part in those acts which are peculiar to one na-

ture the divine nature had part in the act of descent, and therefore we say that the divine nature also descended into hell. For example, as by virtue of the death of Christ as man, we can say God died, so by virtue of the descent of Christ as man, we can say God descended. To refute the error that Christ descended into hell according to His divinity only, is to prove that He descended according to His humanity.

If any doubt that Christ descended into hell according to His humanity, we ask them carefully to examine the following words of Holy Writ, viz. "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the Just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God." 1 Peter 3, 18. This Christ that once suffered, that He might bring us to God, is Jesus Christ, the God-man, and this suffering was participated in by both natures of Christ. Had His human nature alone participated in these sufferings, His sufferings would not have sufficed to "bring us to God." But suffering is not a property of the divine nature, but of the human nature only, therefore while He suffered as God-man, this suffering was possible by virtue of His human nature alone, and His divinity had part in this suffering alone by virtue of its union with the humanity.

The acme of this suffering was His death. But He was "put to death in the flesh" (1 Peter 3, 18.) i. e. according to His humanity, of which alone death can properly be predicated. He who was put to death in the flesh was also "quickened by the Spirit," (1 Peter 3, 18.) i. e. the *man* Christ, who was put to death, was also made alive again by the Spirit, i. e. by Christ's own divine power, as revealed in John 2, 19, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up again," and also in John 10, 17, "I lay down my life, that I might take it again. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." He who was put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit, i. e. the *man* Christ, by the power of the Spirit, His own divine power, "went and preached unto the spirits in prison," or in other words, the *man* Christ Jesus descended into hell, or what may be still plainer, Christ descended into hell according to His humanity.

We presume that none will deny that Christ ascended

into heaven according to His humanity, but the same Christ that ascended into heaven, also descended into hell, and that too by the same power and in the same manner, as we learn from Eph. 4, 9-10, "Now that He ascended, what is it but that He also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that He might fill all things." For these reasons we believe that He who descended into hell is Jesus Christ, the God-man. It will now be in order for us to try to determine *secondly, the place to which Christ descended.*

Among those who accept the declaration, "He descended into hell," we find a great diversity of opinion concerning the meaning of the word hell. Many accept this word as meaning simply the grave, or receptacle of lifeless bodies, while others accept it as meaning a *place* into which the wicked, i. e. the fallen angels, and those dying in impenitence, are cast, to suffer forever the just retribution of God.

It is in this last mentioned sense, viz. as the name of the abode of the damned, that the Lutheran Church accepts the word "hell," in the sentence, "He descended into hell," as found in the second article of the Apostles' Creed, and she uses these words to express her belief that Christ truly "went" to that place of eternal anguish and torment prepared for the devil and his angels, and into which are finally cast all who persistently resist God's grace in this life.

We, therefore, reject as anti-scriptural that explanation of the word hell, by which it is said to mean simply the grave, and by which the sentence, "He descended into hell," is said to mean nothing more than that He was laid into the grave. The simple fact that this sentence is found in the Apostles' Creed denies this explanation. In the same article of the same Creed, as formulated by its authors, we find the words, "Crucified, dead and buried," which words evidently mean that Christ died upon the cross, and being really dead, He was buried, i. e. His body was placed into the tomb, sepulchre, or grave. Therefore if the words, "He descended into hell," mean nothing more than that He descended into the grave, they would have no office, or purpose, and would never have been placed in the Creed, for if that were their

meaning it would have been more *fully* and *fitly* expressed in the words "crucified, dead and buried."

Neither does the scriptural use of the word hell, justify us in interpreting it as meaning the grave. It is true, as the advocates of this theory argue, that in the original language of the Old Testament, the Hebrew, the inspired writers used the word "sheol" to designate the grave, as we see in Gen. 37, 35, where Jacob says, "I will go down in the grave (Heb. sheol) unto my son mourning." And again in Gen. 42, 38, "Then shall ye bring down my gray hairs with sorrow to the grave," (Heb. sheol); which are but examples of many other passages which might be cited. But they also used the same word "sheol" to denote the place where the wicked, or the damned, are tormented, and in all such instances we find it translated by the word hell. For example we read in Prov. 15, 11, "Hell and destruction are before the Lord." And in Ps. 9, 17, "The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God." All men, both pious and wicked, shall go down into the grave, but only the wicked, and those that forget God shall be turned into hell, showing us that the grave and hell are two distinct places.

Nor is it any contradiction that the same word, (sheol) should in one instance mean the grave, as we understand the word grave, and in another instance mean hell, as we understand the word hell. It is characteristic of all languages that words composed of the same letters, and having the same sound, may have entirely different meanings in different connections. Take for instance the English language and we find many such words. We will cite but two. The word b-o-w in one connection means an instrument to shoot with, in another connection it means an article of dress, and in still another connection it means the sign of God's grace in the heavens. The word e-a-r is also one of similar character. In one connection it means the member of the body through which we receive sounds, and in another connection it means the ripened grain of wheat or corn.

What is true of the Hebrew word "sheol," is also true of the Greek word "hades," i. e. in one instance it means the grave, as we understand that word, and in another instance it means hell, as we understand that word. In 1 Cor. 15, 55,

we read, "O grave (Greek *hades*) where is thy victory?" And again in Rev. 20, 13, "And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them." Here we find the Greek word "*hades*" translated hell, but the connection shows that it speaks of the resurrection, and therefore uses the word in the same sense in which we use the word grave. (?)

But the same Greek word "*hades*" is also used to designate the horrible pit in which the damned are tormented, as is evident from the record found in Luke 16, 23, "And in hell (Greek *hades*) he lifted up his eyes being in torments." Thus we learn that both these words, viz. the Hebrew word "*sheol*," and the Greek word "*hades*," are used in this two-fold sense, and the sense in which they are used is always apparent from the connection in which they stand.

Confining ourselves to the authorized English version of the Bible, we find the words *grave* and *hell* frequently used, each with its own particular meaning, and each designating a particular place. We find the word *grave* invariably used to denote the place where the body remains from the time of its burial until its resurrection, and when referring to the body of the *pious*, it is always called a place of *rest*. In Ps. 16, 9, we read, "My flesh also shall rest in hope." Isa. 57, 2, "They shall rest in their beds." 2 Chron. 16, 14, "And they buried him in his own sepulchre, *** and laid him in the bed which was filled with sweet odors and divers kind of spices." Job 17, 16, "They shall go down to the bars of the pit, where our rest together is in the dust."

If we go to the New Testament, we find the word *grave* uniformly used in the same sense. In Matt. 27, 52, we read, "And the graves were opened, and many bodies of the saints which *slept* arose." In John 5, 28-29, we read, "The hour is coming, in the which all that are in their graves shall hear His voice, and shall come forth." Thus may we easily learn in what sense the holy Scriptures use the word *grave*.

Nor need we have any greater difficulty in learning in what sense they use the word *hell*, for we find it always used to denote the abiding place, not of the bodies, but of the souls of men, and *never* as a place of *rest*, but as a place of intense and eternal anguish and torment. In Ps. 16, 10, we find that

it speaks of the suffering of hell in connection with the soul, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell."

This becomes strikingly apparent in the history of the beggar Lazarus, and of the certain rich man, as given in Luke 16, 19-31. They both died and were buried. But the soul of Lazarus was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom, while the soul of the rich man was pressed down into hell by the crushing weight of millions of unrepented and unforgiven sins, and "in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments."

That the word hell, as used in the holy Scriptures, means not the grave, a place of rest, but the place of indescribable horror and torment, in which the souls of the damned are imprisoned, is also evident from 2 Peter 2, 4, "God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness to be reserved unto judgment."

Unto the pious God's Word represents the grave as a "bed filled with odors, and divers kind of spices," in which the weary pilgrim may lay his worn body down in sweet repose, to await the Master's call on the joyous resurrection morn. But by the word hell, the Scriptures reveal a bottomless pit of horrors, "a lake of fire burning with brimstone," in which, in an incomprehensible manner, dwell and suffer forever, "the fearful and unbelieving, and abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars." A place of outer darkness, a furnace of fire, a place of weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth, a place of eternal suffering, the inhabitants of which are forever dying, yet never dead.

And yet, there are many who try to make us believe that the words grave and hell mean one and the same thing. We do, indeed, believe that Christ descended into the grave, that place of rest which the Scriptures designate by the word grave, but that faith we express in the word "buried."

We also believe that Christ descended into hell, that abode of the damned which the Scriptures call hell, and this faith we express in the words, "He descended into hell." And truly this faith and confession are founded upon the sure and plain Word of God, as is clearly proven by 1 Peter

3, 18-19, "He," Christ, "went and preached unto the *spirits*," and therefore went not to the grave, for spirits do not dwell in the grave. Moreover, He "went and preached unto the spirits in *prison*," and therefore not to the spirits of the redeemed, or saved, for they dwell not in prison, but in heaven, in the beautiful mansions which a loving Father hath prepared for His *free* children.

But "He went and preached unto the spirits in *prison*," and therefore unto the spirits of the lost, of the damned, for they are in prison, "delivered into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment." Therefore this prison to which He went is none other than the abode of the damned, to which abode God's Word has given the name hell, and descending into this abode, or prison, He descended into hell, hence our confession, "He descended into hell." From the above it can easily be understood to what place we believe Christ descended, and leaving this feature of the subject, we shall now endeavor to present *Thirdly, the purpose for which He descended.*

Many exclude the words "He descended into hell," from the Apostles' Creed, because they do not believe the faith they express. Being subject to their own reason, rather than to the Word of God, they think that even Christ could not be in hell without suffering, or descend into hell for any other purpose than to suffer, and denying that which God's Word does not ask them to believe, viz. that Christ descended into hell to suffer, they deny that He descended into hell at all.

While we do not, with them, deny that Christ could be in hell without suffering, we do most certainly, with them, deny that He descended into hell for the purpose of suffering. Christ did, indeed, suffer, in all its fulness and sharpness, that penalty which God pronounced against sin, which is eternal death. (Rom. 6, 23.) For this very purpose He came into this world, that He might take the sinner's place, that He might suffer in our stead, that we, through His suffering the penalty of our sins, might be freed from that penalty. He came into this world to redeem us from hell, and to do that He must pay our debt, must suffer that judgment, or punishment to which we were condemned, even the pains of hell.

But this is the purpose for which He came into *this world*, not the purpose for which He descended into hell, and in this world He accomplished and completed that for which He came into the world. This was accomplished and completed by His humble, holy life here upon earth, and by His most bitter sufferings and death upon the cross, when He truly suffered the pains of eternal death, the anguish of hell, and where He forever finished and ended His sufferings, as it is written, John 19, 30, "It is finished." That is, the redemption of man was finished, the sufferings of Christ were finished, and having finished His sufferings here upon earth, He certainly did not descend into hell to repeat or to continue His sufferings.

The purpose of Christ's descent into hell was not to suffer, but to *preach*. "He went and *preached* unto the spirits in prison," i. e. unto those who were cast down to hell, and delivered into chains of darkness. He went unto the spirits in prison to preach unto them, but that which He preached was not the Gospel. True, it may be argued that unto the spirits in prison, Christ proclaimed Himself as the Conquerer of sin, death, and hell, the Savior of the world, and therefore preached the Gospel. But to this it may justly be answered, in the very words of Hollazius, that "The preaching of Christ in hell was *not evangelical*, which is proclaimed to men only in the kingdom of grace, but legal, accusatory, terrible, and that too, both *verbal*, by which He convinced them that they had merited eternal punishment, and *real*, by which He struck frightful terror into them." (Schmidt's Dogmat. p. 412-21.) While the words are such as are found in the Gospel message, the object of their proclamation on the occasion in question, was not evangelical, but legal, i. e. the object was not to lead those to whom they were addressed to repentance and faith, seeing their day of grace being past, but to *convince* them of the *certainty* and *justness* of their condemnation.

Wherever the Gospel is truly preached, God offers the full and gracious forgiveness of all sins for Christ's sake, offers free and full deliverance from all condemnation, offers a full restoration of the image of God in which man was created, offers a full restoration to the inheritance of eternal glory, offers all this to all who hear it, and gives the power to

believe it, and declares that whosoever believes it shall be saved. "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature, He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." (Mark 16, 15-16.) Consequently, had Christ descended into hell to preach the Gospel there, He would have offered to the fallen angels restoration to that blessedness which they wilfully forfeited in heaven, and would have offered to men that grace which they persistently despised and rejected in this life, would have offered to them all freedom from their condemnation, and admittance to eternal glory.

But that would have been to contradict every word and action of His life in this world. It would have been to contradict the entire holy Scriptures. In this written Word, God teaches us that in this world the doors of the kingdom of grace stand open for us, night and day, and that He calls to us all our life-long to enter its gracious portals, and warns us that if we refuse to enter its blessed gates in this world, they will be forever closed against us. This Christ tells us in John 9, 4, "The night cometh in which no man worketh." And still more plainly in the parable of the ten virgins. The five foolish virgins neglected to prepare for the coming of the Bridegroom in the time allotted for this purpose, and when He came, "they that were ready went in with Him, and *the door was shut*. Afterward came also the other virgins, saying, Lord, Lord, open to us. But He answered and said, Verily I say unto you, *I know you not*." So shall it be with everyone who refuses to enter the kingdom of grace in this life. Christ also teaches us this same truth in the parable of the unmerciful servant, who despised his master's mercy, for which his lord was wroth with him, and delivered him to the tormenters, till he should pay all that was due unto him. "So likewise shall my heavenly Father do also unto you, if ye from your hearts forgive not everyone his brother their trespasses."

That the doom of the lost is forever fixed, is irrevocable, is apparent also from the parable of the rich man, who "in hell lifted up his eyes, being in torments," and prayed that Lazarus might be sent to him, to comfort him, but who received the crushing answer, "Between us and you there is a

great gulf fixed; so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot; neither they pass to us, that would come from thence." Luke 16, 26. In Prov. 11, 17, we find a plain positive declaration of the same truth, in the words, "When a wicked man dieth, *his expectation shall perish*, and the hope of unjust men perisheth." Surely God's Word justifieth us in saying that Christ descended into hell, *neither to suffer nor to preach the Gospel there.*

Asking God, through His Word, the purpose of Christ's descent into hell, we receive that answer which leads us to believe and to teach that He descended into hell for the sole purpose of proclaiming to those who dwell in the black and desolate regions of eternal death, His full and glorious victory over them. Christ came into this world to fight against the great seven headed and ten horned Dragon, sin and death, the devil and hell. He entered into the momentous contest, and the great Dragon was overthrown, was cast out. That old serpent, called the devil and Satan, was conquered, with all his hosts, his power was taken from him, and he was put under the feet of Him who hath received all power in heaven and on earth, and who hath put all things under His feet.

Christ fulfilled the law, and consequently deprived sin of its strength, and death of its sting, which was all the armor wherein Satan trusted, and having thus conquered Satan, sin and death, Christ, as a conquering hero is wont to do, entered the citadel of the conquered, and demanded and received the keys thereof, and declared unto them His authority and their subjection, and destroyed their principalities and powers, mightily triumphing over them, as Christ declares in Rev. 1, 18, "I have the keys of hell and of death," and in Col. 2, 15, "Having spoiled principalities and powers, He made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it."

Christ conquered sin, death and hell, and having won this most glorious of all victories, "He descended into hell," to proclaim to the fallen and conquered hordes His victory over them, and having done this, He appeared alive again unto men on the morning of the third day, and thus forever confirmed to His waiting children the certainty of that vic-

tory over sin and death which He won for *them*, and having thus with power proclaimed His victory in hell and on earth, He ascended up on high leading captivity captive, and bestowing blessings upon men.

A HARMONY OF THE GOSPELS ON THE RESURRECTION.

The importance of the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead is so great, that it is worthy of being made the starting point—the central point, in fact—of any inquiry into the divine character of the Christian religion and of its Founder. “If this fails, the Christian religion cannot be maintained, or may be proved to be false. *If Christ be not risen, argues Paul of Tarsus, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain.* (1 Cor. 15, 14.) On the other hand, if this holds good, the divine mission and authority of the Founder of our holy religion are established. To this He Himself appealed, as the great and ultimate proof, which was to convince mankind that He was what He professed Himself to be—the Son of God, the Savior of the world. If we peruse the history of that event, we must conclude either that He arose, or that His disciples stole His body away. The more we consider the latter alternative, the more impossible it appears. Every time, indeed, that Jesus Christ attempted to perform a miracle, He risked His credit on its accomplishment: had He failed in *one* instance, that would have blasted His reputation forever. The same remark is applicable to His predictions: had any of them failed, that great character which He had to support, would have received an indelible stain. Of all His predictions, there is not one on which He and His disciples laid greater stress than that of His resurrection. So frequently, indeed, had Christ publicly foretold that He would rise again on the third day, that those persons who caused Him to be put to death were acquainted with this prediction; and, being in power, *used every possible means to prevent its accomplishment, or any imposition on the public in that affair.*”

Thus writes Horne in his celebrated *Introduction*; and where is the man who does not see the force of the argument presented?

Since so much depends upon the fulfillment of the predictions in regard to the resurrection of Jesus from the dead, we will examine those predictions in the very outset; for they show us what we must expect to find in connection with the history whose harmony we are writing.

THE PREDICTIONS.

1. The very first prediction which our Lord made in respect to His resurrection is found in the second chapter of John's Gospel. When Jesus had made a scourge of small cords, and had driven those that sold oxen and sheep and doves, and the money-changers, out of the temple; "and poured out the changers' money, and overthrew the tables; and said unto them that sold doves, Take these things hence; make not my Father's house a house of merchandise;" "then answered the Jews and said unto Him, What sign showest Thou unto us, seeing Thou doest these things? Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up. Then said the Jews, Forty and six years was this temple in building, and wilt Thou rear it up in three days? *But He spake of the temple of His body.* When therefore He was risen from the dead, His disciples remembered that He had said this unto them; and they believed the Scripture, and the word which Jesus had said." John 2, 13-22.

2. Another prediction made by the Savior in the early part of His public ministry is recorded in Matthew 12, 38-40: "Then certain of the scribes and of the Pharisees answered, saying, Master, we would see a sign from Thee. But He answered and said unto them, An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign: and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas: for as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth."

3. Matthew 16, 21. "From that time forth began Jesus to show unto His disciples, how that He must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day." See Mark 8, 31.

4. Matthew 20, 17-19. "And Jesus going up to Jerusalem took the twelve disciples apart in the way, and said unto them, Behold we go up to Jerusalem; and the Son of man shall be betrayed unto the chief priests and unto the scribes, and they shall condemn Him to death, and shall deliver Him to the Gentiles to mock and to scourge, and to crucify Him: and the third day He shall rise again."

5. Matthew 26, 1-2, 31 and 32. "And it came to pass, when Jesus had finished all these sayings, He said unto His disciples, Ye know that after two days is the feast of the passover, and the Son of man is betrayed to the crucified. Then said Jesus unto them, All ye shall be offended because of me this night: for it is written, I will smite the Shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad. But after I am risen again, I will go before you into Galilee." See also Mark 9, 31, and Luke 9, 22.

6. That Christ's predictions concerning His resurrection were well known, not only to His disciples, but also to His enemies, is shown by the conduct of the chief priests and Pharisees, as recorded in Matt. 27, 63-66. On this point let us hear what Horne has to say in his *Introduction*: "No one surely can doubt that Christ foretold His resurrection, who considers that it was *on this very account* that the chief priests and Pharisees appointed a watch to guard His sepulchre, and commanded the stone to be sealed. Sir, said they to Pilate, we remember that that deceiver said, while He was yet alive, after three days I will rise again. Command, therefore, that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day, lest His disciples come by night and steal Him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead; so the last error shall be worse than the first. Pilate saith unto them, Ye have a watch; go your way, make it as sure as you can. So they went and made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone and setting the watch. This . . . was such a matter of fact, as the disciples neither could nor durst invent in opposition to the public knowledge which every one had of it; and which, besides, agrees very well with the other circumstances of that event. For whence originated the report which was spread at Jerusalem, that the watch slept when the disciples took away the body of

Jesus, if they had not really set a watch to guard the sepulchre? And what necessity was there to appoint a watch to guard it, had it not been to prevent the disciples from propagating the report that He was risen from the dead?"

From what has thus far been said it is plain that Christ foretold His resurrection from the dead and that it would take place on the third day after His crucifixion. Hence we are justified in expecting to find a thorough agreement in the different accounts of the resurrection so far as the time when it occurred, is concerned.

We come now to consider what the sacred writers have to say in regard to

THE FULFILLMENT OF CHRIST'S PREDICTIONS CONCERNING HIS RESURRECTION FROM THE DEAD.

Since Jesus was crucified on Friday, it was necessary for Him to rise from the dead some time on the first day of the following week, in order that His predictions might be fulfilled. Now all the evangelists agree that Jesus arose on the first day of the week, inasmuch as all of them inform us that the grave in which He had been buried, was found empty early in the morning of that day. That He arose either at or near or before day-break is plain from what Matthew tells us: "In the end of the sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre. And behold there was a great earthquake: for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it. His countenance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow: and for fear of him the keepers did shake, and became as dead men. And the angel answered and said unto the women, Fear not ye: for I know that ye seek Jesus, which was crucified. He is not here: for He is risen, as He said. Come, see the place where the Lord lay." But we are not told by any of the holy evangelists precisely at what hour the resurrection occurred; we know only that He arose on the third day after His crucifixion some time between six o'clock in the evening and sunrise on the following morning. St. Paul tells us that Christ "rose again the third day according to the Scriptures." That the sun had already risen when the women arrived at the sepulchre is evident from what Mark tells us: "And very early in the morning, the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun." The original is ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ήλιου—the sun having risen. We must therefore understand Matthew's words—"as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week"—as referring to the time when the women *began* their journey to the sepulchre, whilst St. Mark refers to the time of their actual arrival at the sepulchre. On

this point Nebe says: "Let it not be overlooked that ἐπέστρατ does not in the least mean only to arrive at a certain place, but also to prepare ourself to get to that point, to be on one's way to a goal. If we make use of this incontestable usage of the word, then all discords are resolved in the completest harmony."

Matthew mentions only Mary Magdalene and the other Mary. To these Mark adds Salome, whilst Luke mentions Joanna "and other women that were with them."

Although all of the evangelists record the fact that the stone, which had closed the sepulchre, was rolled away, Matthew is the only one who gives us the information that it was rolled away by an angel. This angel sat upon the stone, and afterward spoke to the women, telling them not to be afraid and that the Lord had risen. St. Mark states that the women "saw a young man sitting on the right side, clothed in a long white garment." This young man, no doubt, was the same person mentioned by Matthew; for he used similar language in speaking to the women. The angel, therefore, had assumed a human form, in order that he might be seen and recognized by the women.

Luke says that "two men stood by them in shining garments," whilst St. John records the fact that Mary Magdalene saw "two angels in white sitting, the one at the head, the other at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain." Here again we have one writer speaking of angels and another of men; from which fact we are warranted in inferring that the angels looked like men. But how does it come that Matthew and Mark speak only of one, while Luke and John speak of two persons, as having appeared unto the women? The reason, no doubt, is that some of the women saw only *one* angel in the sepulchre; for angels assume a visible form for a special purpose and for the benefit of special persons, but ordinarily are invisible to mortal eyes. On the other hand, Mary Magdalene and some others saw two angels, whilst Peter and John, though they also entered the sepulchre according to the latter's Gospel, make no mention of having seen any angel or angels at all. As the wind bloweth where it listeth, so angels appear only to whom they will, and are not seen by all.

The seeming discrepancy can, however, also be explained in another way. According to St. John's account Mary Magdalene saw the two angels after he and Peter had departed from the sepulchre; hence the angels may have come for her benefit especially. Moreover, we are warranted in explaining the text of Luke in such a way as to show that no one but Mary saw two angels at the sepulchre; for, although he says that "two men stood by *them* (the women) in shining garments," he afterwards says that "it was Mary Magdalene, and

Joanna, and Mary the mother of James, and other women that were with them, which told these things unto the apostles." Hence he wishes us to understand what the women, all and singular, witnessed, although only Mary may have seen two angels, the others having seen but one. This is, perhaps, the best way to explain the words of St. Luke; and when they are so explained there is no longer even a seeming discrepancy between his account and that of the other evangelists.

The following fact is recorded by Mark and John, but omitted by Matthew and Luke:

"Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, He appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom He had cast seven devils. And she went and told them that had been with Him, as they mourned and wept. And they, when they had heard that he was alive, and had been seen of her, believed not." John's account is fuller. "But Mary stood without at the sepulchre weeping: and as she wept, she stooped down, and looked into the sepulchre, and seeth two angels in white sitting, the one at the head, and the other at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain. And they say unto her, Woman, why weepest thou? She saith unto them, Because they have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid Him. And when she had thus said, she turned herself back, and saw Jesus standing, and knew not that it was Jesus. Jesus saith unto her, Woman, why weepest thou? Whom seekest thou? She, supposing Him to be the gardener, saith unto Him, Sir, if Thou have borne Him hence, tell me where Thou hast laid Him, and I will take Him away. Jesus saith unto her, Mary. She turned herself, and saith unto Him, Rabbuni; which is to say, Master. Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God. Mary Magdalene came and told the disciples that she had seen the Lord, and that He had spoken these things unto her."

Luke 24, 12 we read: "Then arose Peter, and ran unto the sepulchre; and stooping down, he beheld the linen clothes laid by themselves, and departed, wondering in himself at that which was come to pass." That he went to the sepulchre after he had been informed by Mary that it was empty, is plain from the account given by St. John: "The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early unto the sepulchre, and seeth the stone taken away from the sepulchre. Then she runneth, and cometh to Simon Peter, and to the other disciple, whom Jesus loved, and saith unto them, They have taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre, and we know not where they have laid Him. Peter therefore went forth, and that other disciple and came to the sepulchre. So they ran both together: and the other disciple did outrun Peter, and came first to the sepulchre. And he stooping down, saw the linen clothes lying; yet went he not in. Then cometh Simon Peter following him, and went into the sepulchre, and seeth the linen clothes lie, and the napkin, that was about His head, not lying with the linen clothes, but wrapped together in a place by itself. Then went in also that other disciple, which came first to the sepulchre, and he saw, and believed. For as yet they knew not the Scripture, that He must rise again from the dead. Then the disciples went away again to their own home." It was after these disciples had gone home that Mary Magdalene, who also had come to the sepulchre after them, saw the Lord, in the manner already described.

St. Mark says: "After that"—namely after Jesus had appeared to Mary Magdalene—He appeared in another form

unto two of them, as they walked, and went into the country. And they went and told it unto the residue: neither believed they them. This is more fully set forth by Luke in the following words:

"And, behold, two of them went that same day to a village called Emmaus, which was from Jerusalem about three-score furlongs. And they talked together of all these things which had happened. And it came to pass, that, while they communed and reasoned, Jesus Himself drew near, and went with them. But their eyes were holden that they should not know Him. And He said unto them, What manner of communications are these that ye have one to another, as ye walk, and are sad? And the one of them, whose name was Cleopas, answering said unto Him, Art Thou only a stranger in Jerusalem, and hast not known the things which are come to pass there in these days? And He said unto them, What things? And they said unto Him, Concerning Jesus of Nazareth, which was a prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people: and how the chief priests and our rulers delivered Him to be condemned to death, and have crucified Him. But we trusted that it had been He which should have redeemed Israel: and beside all this, to-day is the third day since these things were done. Yea, and certain women also of our company made us astonished, which were early at the sepulchre; and when they found not His body, they came, saying, that they had also seen a vision of angels, which said that He was alive. And certain of them which were with us went to the sepulchre, and found it even so as the women had said: but Him they saw not. Then He said unto them, O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken: ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into His glory? And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, He expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself. And they drew nigh unto the village, whither they went; and He made as though He would have gone further. But they constrained Him, saying, Abide with us; for it is toward evening, and the day is far spent. And He went in to tarry with them. And it came to pass, as He sat at meat with them. He took bread, and blessed it, and brake, and gave to them. And their eyes were opened, and they knew Him; and He vanished out of their sight. And they said one to another, Did not our heart burn within us, while He talked with us by the way, and while He opened to us the Scriptures? And they rose up the same hour, and returned to Jerusalem, and found the eleven gathered together, and them that were with them, saying, The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon. And they told what things were done in the way, and how He was known of them in breaking of bread."

The other Gospels—Matthew and John—make no mention of the journey to Emmaus.

"And as they thus spake," says Luke 24, 36-48, "Jesus Himself stood in the midst of them, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you. But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit. And He said unto them, Why are ye troubled? And why do thoughts arise in your hearts? Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have. And when He had thus spoken, He showed them His hands and His feet. And while they yet believed not for joy, and wondered, He said unto them, Have ye any meat? And they gave Him a piece of a broiled fish, and of a honeycomb. And He took it and did eat before them. And He said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me. Thus opened He their understanding, that they might understand the Scriptures, and said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suf-

fer, and to rise from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name among all nations beginning at Jerusalem. And ye are witnesses of these things."

The parallel passage in John is: "Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you. And when He had so said, He showed unto them His hands and His side. Then were the disciples glad, when they saw the Lord. Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you: as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when He had said this, He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained."

Although the two accounts we have quoted differ, they are not in any sense or degree antagonistic, but complementary: they are in thorough harmony with each other, and give us a complete view of what occurred on the evening of the day of the resurrection.

The record of the same fact as given by Mark is very short: "Afterward He appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat, and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen Him after He was risen." We regard this as a parallel passage to those we have just quoted from Luke and John, although we are not unaware of the fact that some have regarded it as belonging to the last appearance of Christ unto His disciples just prior to His ascension into heaven. To us it seems much better to refer it to the evening of the day of the resurrection; for how could the Savior upbraid the disciples, at the last meeting He had with them, for not believing what those told them who had seen Him after He was risen? Had not all the disciples, even Thomas himself, seen Him with their own eyes and on various occasions, and had they not rejoiced in the fact that they had seen Him and heard Him and conversed with Him? Whatever weakness the disciples may have had forty days after the resurrection, they certainly did not any longer doubt whether Christ had risen or not. Of that fact they were thoroughly convinced, as their own words and actions abundantly testify. We, therefore, feel justified in calling the passage cited from Mark a parallel to the quotations we have made from Luke and John.

Matthew tells us that when the women were going, "behold, some of the watch came into the city, and showed unto the chief priests all the things that were done. And when they were assembled with the elders, and had taken counsel, they gave large money unto the soldiers, saying, Say ye, His disciples came by night, and stole Him away while we slept.

And if this come to the governor's ears, we will persuade him and secure you. So they took the money, and did as they were taught: and this saying is commonly reported among the Jews until this day."

We will now take up the account given by St. John in regard to Thomas: "But Thomas one of the twelve, called Didymus, was not with them when Jesus came. The other disciples therefore said unto him, We have seen the Lord. But he said unto them, Except I shall see in His hands the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into His side, I will not believe. And after eight days again His disciples were within, and Thomas with them: then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you. Thus saith He to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side; and be not faithless, but believing. And Thomas answered and said unto Him, My Lord and my God. Jesus saith unto him, Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed."

The same writer also says: "After these things Jesus showed Himself again to the disciples at the sea of Tiberias; and on this wise showed He Himself. There were together Simon Peter, and Thomas called Didymus, and Nathaneal of Cana in Galilee, and the sons of Zebedee, and two other of His disciples. Simon Peter saith unto them, I go a fishing. They say unto him, We also go with thee. They went forth, and entered into a ship immediately; and that night they caught nothing. But when the morning was now come, Jesus stood on the shore; but the disciples knew not that it was Jesus. Then Jesus saith unto them, Children, have ye any meat? They answered Him, No. And He said unto them, Cast the net on the right side of the ship, and ye shall find. They cast therefore, and now they were not able to draw it for the multitude of fishes. Therefore that disciple whom Jesus loved saith unto Peter, It is the Lord. Now when Simon Peter heard that it was the Lord, he girt his fisher's coat unto him (for he was asked), and did cast himself into the sea. And the other disciple came in a little ship, (for they were not far from land, but as it was two hundred cubits), dragging the net with fishes. As soon then as they were come to land, they saw a fire of coals there, and fish laid thereon, and bread. Jesus saith unto them, Bring of the fish which ye have now caught. Simon Peter went up, and drew the net to land full of great fishes, a hundred and fifty and three: and for all there were so many, yet was not the net broken. Jesus saith unto them, Come and dine. And none of the disciples durst ask Him, Who art Thou? knowing that it was the Lord. Jesus then cometh, and taketh bread, and giveth them, and

fish likewise. This is now the third time that Jesus showed Himself to His disciples, after that He was risen from the dead.

"So when they had dined, Jesus saith to Simon Peter, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these? He saith unto Him, Yea, Lord; Thou knowest that I love Thee. He saith unto him, Feed my lambs. He saith to him again the second time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? He saith unto Him, Yea, Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee. He saith unto him, Feed my sheep. He saith unto him the third time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? Peter was grieved because He said unto him the third time, lovest thou me? And he said unto Him, Lord, Thou knowest all things; Thou knowest that I love Thee. Jesus saith unto him, Feed my sheep. Verily, verily, I say unto thee, When thou wast young, thou girdest thyself, and walkedst whither thou wouldest: but when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldest not. This spake He, signifying by what death he should glorify God. And when He had spoken this, He saith unto him, Follow me. Then Peter, turning about, seeth the disciple whom Jesus loved following; which also leaned on His breast at supper, and said, Lord, which is he that betrayeth Thee? Peter seeing him saith to Jesus, Lord, and what shall this man do? Jesus saith unto him, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? Follow thou me. Then went this saying abroad among the brethren, that that disciple should not die: yet Jesus said not unto him, He shall not die; but, If I will that he tarry till I come, What is that to thee? This is the disciple which testifieth of those things, and wrote those things: and we know that his testimony is true."

Matthew takes us into Galilee in this wise: "Then the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, into a mountain where Jesus had appointed them. And when they saw Him they worshiped Him: but some doubted. And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen."

The parallel to this is found in the words of St. Mark: "And He said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned; And these signs shall follow them that believe; In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink

any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover." Although St. Augustine regarded this passage as belonging to the account of what took place on Easter evening, we think there are more points of coincidence in it with what Matthew records, than with the record of Luke and John to which the illustrious church-father refers.

Christ's sojourn on earth closes with His ascension into heaven. "So then, after the Lord had spoken unto them, He was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God. And they went forth, and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following. Amen." Mark 16, 19-20. Following is Luke's account: "And He led them out as far as to Bethany, and He lifted up His hands and blessed them. And it came to pass, while He blessed them, He was parted from them, and carried up into heaven. And they worshiped Him, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy: and were continually in the temple, praising and blessing God. Amen." Luke 24, 50-53. In the first chapter of Acts the same writer gives us a succinct statement as to what occurred from the resurrection to the ascension of our blessed Lord—a statement from which we learn what length of time intervened between the two glorious events: "The former treatise have I made, O Theophilus, of all that Jesus began both to do and teach, until the day in which He was taken up, after that He through the Holy Ghost had given commandments unto the Apostles whom He had chosen: to whom also He showed Himself alive after His passion by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God: and being assembled together with them, commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, which, saith He, ye have heard of me. For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence. When they therefore were come together, they asked of Him, saying, Lord, wilt Thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel? And He said unto them, It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in His own power. But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth. And when He had spoken these things, while they beheld, He was taken up; and a cloud received Him out of their sight. And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven as He went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus,

which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven. Then returned they unto Jerusalem from the mount called Olivet, which is from Jerusalem a Sabbath day's journey." Acts 1, 1-12.

St. Paul's record of the resurrection is found in 15. chapter of 1 Corinthians, vv. 3-8: "For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that He was buried, and that He rose again the third day according to the Scriptures; and that He was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve; after that, He was seen of above five hundred brethren at once; of whom the greater part remain unto the present, but some are fallen asleep. After that He was seen of James; then of all the Apostles. And last of all He was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time."

It will thus be seen that the account given by the sacred writers of the resurrection of Jesus from the dead, is in harmony with the transcendent importance of that glorious and wonderful event.

We will now examine some of the more

DIFFICULT POINTS CONNECTED WITH THE HISTORY OF THE RESURRECTION.

1. *As to the time of the resurrection.* It took place on the third day after the crucifixion. How does this fact harmonize with the Savior's statement, that "as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth?" Matt. 12, 40. From Friday evening to Sunday morning we have but two nights and one full day, with a part of Friday and a part of Sunday. How, then, could the Savior say that He would be *three days* and especially *three nights* in the heart of the earth? He could do so according to the custom of the age in which He spoke; for at that time a *part* of a day was frequently spoken of as if it were a *whole* day composed of a day and a night. Jesus was buried before six o'clock on Friday evening—for the Jewish Sabbath began at six on Friday evening, and we learn from John XIX, that the bodies of those that were crucified were not permitted to remain on the cross on the Sabbath day—and Thursday night was reckoned with Friday; and He rose early on Sunday morning. Thus three days in whole or in part were identified with the time of His stay in the grave; and as part of days were regarded and spoken of by the Jews as whole days, the Savior's language is easily explained and shown to be in harmony with the facts in the case involved.

2. Another point which presents some difficulty, is *the appearance of Christ to Mary Magdalene.* Mark and John tell us that He appeared unto her first of all. But Matthew says

that Mary Magdalene and the other Mary went early on the first day of the week to see the sepulchre, and that the angel said unto the women. Fear not ye, etc., "and as they went to tell His disciples, behold Jesus met them, saying, All hail. And they came and held Him by the feet, and worshipped Him." Now the question arises, How could Jesus appear *first* to Mary Magdalene, seeing that she went *with* the other women to see the sepulchre? The matter can be best explained in this way: When the women approached the sepulchre and were talking about the question as to who would roll the stone away from the door for them, they looked and saw that the stone was already rolled away; then Mary Magdalene, supposing the body to have been taken away, immediately went back, without further examining the sepulchre, whilst the other women remained and were spoken to by the angel and afterwards met by the Lord. This is in harmony with John's statement, who mentions only Mary Magdalene as having gone to the sepulchre: "She seeth," says he "the stone taken away from the sepulchre. Then she *runneth* and cometh to Simon Peter, and the other disciple, whom Jesus loved, and saith unto them, They have taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre and we know not where they have laid Him." Having thus informed Peter and John, she followed them to the sepulchre, and while there she saw, not only the angels, but the Savior Himself, who appeared *afterwards* to the other women in her absence.

3. Another difficulty and one which Nebe calls a *crux interpretum*, is the fact that Christ said to Mary Magdalene, "Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father," although He permitted the other women to hold Him by the feet, and said to the doubting disciples, "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: *handle me, and see;* for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have," and to Thomas: "Reach hither thy hand, *and thrust it into my side;* and be not faithless, but believing." Why, then, did He tell Mary not to touch Him? After studying the various interpretations both ancient and modern, we are convinced that Nebe is, for the most part, right when he says: "To me this statement does not by any means seem so difficult as it is commonly regarded. If we translate the words: *μη μων ἀττον, do not lay hold of me, do not cling to me, do not hold me so fast,* as they can, according to the judgment of all exegetes and lexicographers unhesitatingly be rendered, then the situation presents itself to us thus: By His voice Mary recognized the Lord whom she had sought with grief, she runs toward Him, casts herself, or is just about to cast herself, at His feet, in order to seize and hold Him fast whom she so unexpectedly found and whom God's grace had so wonderfully presented to her again, her object being to prevent His being taken away from her

again. Is not this rushing forward, in order, as it were, to take possession of Him and to lay hold on Him with her hand, so as to compel Him to remain with her, perfectly explainable? What does a man do when he finds a treasure which had been taken away from him and to which his lust had clung? He seizes it with both hands. A man who, by the grace of God, finds a friend, in the full vigor of life and healthy in body, soul and spirit, embraces him and presses him to his bosom with joy and rapture, because he has him again. Mary does not in her excitement and enraptured condition overlook the fact that there is a barrier between herself and the risen One; she therefore does not put her arms around Him, but sinks down at His feet and lays hold of His knees. She rejoices that she has Him again, and wishes to hold Him fast that He may remain with her. To this conception of the matter the reason given by Christ for His command is eminently appropriate: "Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father." She does not need to hold Him fast so convulsively; there is as yet no danger; she shall not see Him this once only, and then no more; the hour of separation has not yet come; He will remain on earth for the present; He will continue for a time with His own. How long she shall yet have Him, He does not intimate; but He does certainly hint at the fact that He has not come to remain with them forever. His ascension has not yet taken place, but it will take place; by this again the fact is silently alluded to that it is well for Mary to seek communion with her Master in something else than in touching and laying hold of Him bodily."

On the whole we think that Nebe is right. It would, perhaps, be better to say that what he says is merely hinted at by the Savior was His chief reason for telling her not to touch Him. Her faith needed to be freed from a certain carnal conception she had of the way in which He is to be apprehended. She was to be taught, though in a different manner, the fact which Thomas afterwards learned, that they are blessed who have not seen, and yet have believed.

4. The last difficulty which we shall notice is the question: How does it come that Luke tells us that the two disciples on returning to Jerusalem from Emmaus, found the *eleven* gathered together, although St. John says that Thomas was not with them? Judas Iscariot had hung himself, and hence the number of the disciples was reduced to *eleven*; but with Thomas absent there were but ten. The reason, no doubt, why Luke speaks of the *eleven* being found together, is because that was the technical term or name by which they were known; just as we would speak of the Board of Directors of our Seminary being gathered together, although one or more of them might be absent. Of course, Luke and Mark

take notice of the fact that there were really but eleven disciples, seeing that Judas could never meet with them again. St. Paul, however, says that the Lord was seen of Cephas, then of the *twelve*, thus using the original name as if Judas had not disappeared from the number. The same explanation holds good in either case: the numbers *twelve* and *eleven* were used respectively to designate the disciples who were made apostles, whether all of them were present at any particular meeting or not.

A. P.

ETERNAL PUNISHMENT.

BY REV. W. SCHMIDT.

Some time ago a circular was sent to representative men of the different denominations of our land, asking them to what extent the orthodox doctrines of the creation, of eternal punishment and others had been causing trouble in their respective churches. The Lutheran representative answered, and no doubt truthfully, that these questions had not even been mooted in our church. Confining ourselves here to the doctrine of eternal punishment we make bold to say: a Lutheran who believes in the great doctrine of the Reformation,—the absolute authority of the Word of God in all things of which it treats;—who believes the entire Bible to be the truth and not only to contain the truth; who still has the old spirit of Luther which Zwingli and Calvin and the Reformed generally did not have, and do not have to-day,—the spirit of unconditional obedience to the plain teachings of Holy Writ that cannot be shaken by any rationalizing or spiritualizing process: such a Lutheran Christian cannot for a moment doubt the Bible doctrine of eternal punishment. It is taught in unmistakable terms. Matt. 25, 46, Christ Himself says: “And these”—the unrighteous, the accursed—“shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal,” and St. Mark 9, 44, He speaks of hell as the place “where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched.”—It is not necessary to multiply such passages. They are as plain as human language can make them. The wicked, the unbelievers who die in their sins, who despise the wedding garment of the king’s son—Christ’s precious blood and righteousness,—and dare to appear before the king in the filthy, ragged garment of their own self-righteousness, will be cast into the place of everlasting punishment where they will suffer awful tortures both in body and soul. Before a Lutheran could deny this or any other doctrine of the Bible he would have to deny the great Lutheran principle of the absolute authority of the Word of God in all matters of

faith; the principle which our Lutheran Symbols have adopted and consistently defended against all rationalism and infidelity. A Lutheran must cease to be such before he can doubt any Scripture doctrine.

The Reformed churches have no such strong wall to hold back the floods of rationalism and infidelity. On the contrary, the very doctrines that distinguish them from the Lutheran church and make them distinctively Reformed are founded upon a hole in the wall. Zwingli and Calvin by their doctrine of the Lord's Supper, their tenacious defense of the right to change the plain literal meaning of a Bible passage, when this is as repugnant to human reason as the literal sense of the words of institution, actually opened the flood-gates to rationalism. That Reformed churches have for so many years still held many precious Bible doctrines proves nothing to the contrary. It only proves the happy inconsistency that kept them from applying their principle of interpretation as used in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper with equal boldness to all the doctrines of the Bible. The open denial of all the fundamental doctrines of God's Word is but a consistent, legitimate result of that one wrong principle of Biblical exegesis. If Zwingli had the right to change the little word "is" into the entirely different word "signifies" on the plea of the absurdity of the literal sense, Beecher, Newman & Co., incontestably have the same right to change the doctrine of eternal punishment into whatever they may see fit on the plea of absurdity and immorality. If all signs do not fail, the Reformed churches are about to reap a great storm in all the fundamental Bible doctrines as a punishment for having sowed wind in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. The representatives of the Reformed churches could not answer like the Lutheran that the doctrine of eternal punishment and others mentioned were still believed by their entire churches as far as they knew. Several admitted that a revolution was going on among them with regard to these doctrines. We do not wonder at this. Once admitting the principle that human reason may in extreme cases sit in judgment over the Word of God, as the Reformed in the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist practically do, where is the authority to hold reason back from upsetting the whole Bible? This Luther clearly recognized. With prophetic mind he foresaw that the smallest hole in the solid wall of divine testimony would in course of time cause the entire wall to tumble. Therefore he would rather have given up his life than the one little word "is"; and much as he has been defamed and denounced for it, as though his stubbornness, his overbearing spirit that was born to rule and could brook no opposition was the cause of the sad split in the Protestant church: in his brave struggle against the Sacramentarians

served his God and his church just as well and was he just as great as in his heroic defense of the doctrine of justification by faith against the Romish Antichrist. We must have the entire Bible or we will soon have no Bible at all. If reason can change and master revelation in one place, why not in all? If Zwingli believed one or two holes in the solid wall of the unconditional authority of the Bible to be allowable, why should not Mr. Swing desire and declare that wall to be "all hole," as a good friend of ours once remarked when he had found a stone that had a hole lined with crystal: "that stone would be much prettier if it were all hole?"

The doctrine of eternal punishment seems to become unpopular very rapidly in some of our American churches, especially since a few bold Rationalists like Beecher have openly denounced it as monstrous and barbarous. The notorious Henry Ward tells us in the kind complimentary way so natural to Liberals that in a few years no intelligent pulpit will advocate this relic of barbarism, the orthodox doctrine of hell, any longer. That ought to settle the whole matter for thinking Christians! If a few old-fashioned Lutherans, some Roman Catholics, who allow their Priests to do their thinking for them and perhaps some other narrow-minded Christians should still continue to believe the Bible doctrine of eternal punishment even after Mr. "B's" time of grace for their enlightenment has expired, all the worse for them, the poor unintelligent beings! Some churchmembers have become so refined and enlightened by the Liberal preachers that they are shocked when they hear a Lutheran minister warn his people from the Word of God against eternal punishment. They think we are using profane language in the pulpit when we speak of the devil, of hell, and of damnation. The change of the plain and forcible saxon word "hell" into "hades" in the revised translation of the New Testament seems to have met an actual demand of our liberal time.

The men who deny the endless punishment of the wicked may be divided into two classes: those who deny any punishment whatever after death, and those who believe in a punishment for a time only. The former boldly declare that for the wicked death means annihilation and that it is absurd to speak of eternal death, because death is instantaneous. They affect great reverence for the literal sense of the Scriptures and profess to believe in the annihilation of the wicked because the only literal meaning of death can be annihilation, to be no more. The fact that God breathed His own immortal breath into Adam's nostrils and thus gave him an immortal soul, does not seem to trouble these Nihilists. The many passages of Holy Writ that speak in the most emphatic terms of the eternity of the suffering of the wicked, are to

them nothing but exceptions to their boasted rule of literal interpretation, though everybody else would wonder why the one case should establish the rule and the hundred cases be exceptions. The Bible doctrine of the three different kinds of death, namely the spiritual death, which came on Adam the moment he partook of the forbidden fruit and consists in the loss of the image of God and in the total depravity of our soul, the bodily death which consists in the parting of soul and body and the eternal death which means eternal punishment, the endless absence from God, the source of all life, never seems to have entered the minds of these advocates of annihilation.

The other class of Liberals are not quite as bold as these. They also deny eternal punishment, but graciously allow God to punish the godless for a time. We think it was an Episcopal minister of New York who wrote not long ago that he found no difficulty to harmonize this theory with the most dreadful declarations of God's Word. The fact that in the Old Testament the word eternal or its synonyms are sometimes used to express simply a very long time—not actual eternity, seems to favor this theory. But in all such instances the limitation of the time is given by the text itself or by the nature of the case. When it is said Exodus 21, 6, that the servant shall serve his master forever, everyone knows that a continued, lifelong slavery is meant which naturally ends with the death of the servant. And when the Lord said concerning the passover Exod. 12, 14, "ye shall keep it a feast by an ordinance forever," the time is naturally limited to the Old Covenant, for when the true Antitype of all the paschal lambs had come, the shadow, the image had to give way to the body. But no sign of such limitation can be found in the inspired expressions that tell us of the endless punishment of the damned.

On the contrary the eternity of punishment in hell is described with the very same terms used to describe the eternity of life in heaven. Matt. 25, 46, the Savior says: And these shall go away into everlasting punishment (*κολαστιν αἰώνων*)! but the righteous into life eternal (*ζωῆς αἰώνων*). It would indeed be nothing short of grammatical and exegetical suicide to deny that the word "eternal" in this and other passages does mean the same endlessness of time when referring to hell as when referring to heaven. That would proclaim the impossibility of expressing a thought in human language, or at least the inability of the Holy Ghost to do so. And yet our liberal theologians are very willing to let the eternity of heavenly joy stand, because that suits their feelings, while they deny the eternity of punishment, because that does not suit them.

Who does not see at a glance that this theory is in fact

nothing more than a repetition of the old papal figment of purgatory, that has been denounced and decided by Protestants as the hight of superstition until now, according to the old maxim that extremes meet, the most liberal or rather sceptical Protestants return to it. As the Romanists are liberal enough to consign only the most wicked criminals directly to hell while all those that are not as yet good enough for heaven nor bad enough for hell must serve their time of punishment and purification in purgatory: liberal theologians would probably find little difficulty in joining hands with Rome in this doctrine, for on account of a few wretches like Judas Iscariot or Guiteau they would no doubt be willing to stretch their principles a little and not pick a quarrel with his Holiness of the Vatican. Here we learn again that the Romish system of doctrine is a good deal more than a gross calculation to get money out of the people, as some are inclined to believe. That practical aim can indeed be found in many Romish doctrines, especially in the doctrine of purgatory. But that is not all by any means. This Romish doctrine of future punishment for a time and a chance to be saved even after death is one of the shrewdest adaptations to the desires and inclinations of the depraved natural heart; it is a pampering and flattering of the old Adam that is all the more dangerous, because, at a superficial glance, the flesh seems to suffer by it most severely. As by their semipelagian doctrine of justification they foster the Pharisaical pride and self-righteousness of the natural man, though on the face of things they would make it appear that they crucified the old Adam by fastings and all kinds of mortifications; and as by doing the thinking for the laity, which seems so preposterous to many Protestants, the Romish hierarchy very shrewdly relies upon and encourages spiritual laziness: so by their doctrine of purgatory, even though it be pictured with all the tortures which the vivid imagination of Dante could conjure up, they actually meet the old Adam more than half-ways in his deepest desires, and try to take the sting out of death and rob hell of its victory. That has been done indeed; death and hell are conquered, God be even praised for it! But it has not been done and never can be done by bold denial of the doctrine of eternal punishment whether Romanists or the advanced Liberals of our times undertake the task. The sainted Apostle could shout triumphantly: death where is thy sting, hell where is thy victory! But he could do so not because he denied eternal punishment but because he believed in Christ who conquered death and hell. Alas for the folly of men! The boasted reasoning of modern sceptics will not save men from eternal punishment, just as little as the dearly bought letters of indulgence brought forgiveness of sins to the poor ignorant Roman Catholics. Whether our

Liberals deny all future punishment and believe in the annihilation of the wicked, or whether they admit a future punishment for a certain time: their teachings are alike unscriptural and therefore false.

But this does not in the least deter our modern Liberals from pushing their claim as reformers of the old church-confessions with the utmost bravado. They try to outdo each other in witty criticisms on the old truths, and, we must add, in blasphemies against the triune God. While the boldest among them simply reject all Scripture passages that speak of eternal punishment as human inventions, the more cautious but less honest try to read their denial of this Bible doctrine into the Bible. Their arguments are all of the same kind, in fact there is but one argument used. Because God is love therefore, they say, He cannot punish the sinner eternally. What a monster God would be, they exclaim with great pathos, if He should rejoice in the terrible sufferings, in the endless tortures of His children. As it is sinful in man to avenge himself, how could God dare to do so! They profess to believe in the Gospel of grace, not of hate and malice. "I hate that God in which our deluded fathers believed, because that is not the great being of love whom we all worship," one preacher will shout and the congregation will clap their hands and shout Amen! Another will say: "If it were not for this immoral doctrine of eternal punishment such good and learned men as Ingersoll might be pious missionaries instead of being the bitterest enemies of Christianity"—and the liberal congregation will mourn with him over the bigotry and narrow-mindedness of the orthodox Christians who drive so many good people out of the church by their old-fashioned doctrines. It is the same old taunt which the church has always had to bear, because she refused to let the world with all its wickedness enter and because she would not believe that Satan would build up the Church of Christ. With such cheap arguments *ad hominem* the advanced liberal preachers try to gain popularity for which they crave first, last, and all the time. With such transparent sophistries they try to sway the masses that are in return only too willing to have their consciences softly lulled to sleep by the siren voices of their deceivers. And when Satan has succeeded in drawing these so-called theologians down to the most awful blasphemies, they by no means feel the terrible sin they are committing. They glory in their work of destruction; pride themselves in driving the old Bible truths out of the hearts of men and substituting their own carnal opinions. They believe to be the leaders of thought, the true representatives of our times or rather of the times to come. They believe to be far ahead of the times in which so many poor deluded souls are still groping in the darkness of ages.

past. They imagine themselves to be throwing a bright light of thought forward into the ages, a light which, similar to the electric headlight, has its concentrated power and brilliancy in one point but which spreads as it goes, constantly expanding until all the world shall be illumined by its rays. A pity it is for these would-be reformers that inexorable history robs them of their boasted courage and originality and proves the laurels which they claim for themselves to belong in part to the old Scholastics of the Romish church, but especially to the old Socinians and their degenerate sons, the German rationalists. And even greater pity it is for them that the old much despised Bible has already known and characterized them by the hateful name of unregenerate, natural man, which is enmity against God, which hates the God of the Bible as a dreadful tyrant who would rob poor innocent men of the few pleasures this life still affords, and besides punish them for not denying themselves. This much however we must say for our modern Rationalists that they do not take much stock in the long and difficult arguments brought forth by their spiritual fathers. Logic is not their strongest point. The armor of a Faustus Socinus is decidedly too heavy for them. They take a few popular ideas and ride these hobbies as long as anyone will pay for seeing the show. They do not trouble themselves with deep researches, and although all of them bow to the goddess of reason, the reasoning power which they reveal is far below that of the old champions of scepticism, while their worldly-mindedness seems to be greater. Beecher e. g., while he detests the doctrine of eternal punishment and rejects that of atonement, professes to believe enthusiastically in the divinity of Christ. His old brethren who were of a more logical turn of mind would have told him that his position was untenable, because a man who committed such terrible blunders as preaching atonement and eternal punishment could never be God. But our modern Liberals care very little about such small logical discrepancies; they want a materialistic religion of the broadest kind, a religion that can take in all the worldly pleasures such as theatres, operas, balls, etc., if they are not too glaringly immoral, and still safely land us in the heavenly fatherland. That these liberal theologians will gladly take up any new fangled theory, such as evolution, is but natural; it gives them a theme to talk about and affords ample room for displaying their rhetoric. But just as natural it is that, if they live long enough, they will finally land in Universalism or Atheism.

The Lutheran Church has had such sad experience with rationalism during the last century, when many of her sons had imbibed the Reformed principle of setting reason above the Word of God, that she abhors any second edition of it,

however much it may be changed and remodeled to suit the times. Though such theological lights as Beecher, Newman, Swing and others who contemptuously throw aside the doctrine of eternal punishment should dazzle the minds of people as an Edison electric lamp dazzles the eye: they have something else in common with the electric light, they have a deathly glare. Besides they are artificial lights like these; a little flaw in the machinery, a single omission of a new charge, and the light of both, the electric lamp and the Liberal theologian, goes out as ignobly as an old lantern whose tallow candle had burned down. Christians will continue to follow the light of God's Word which will never extinguish, even though the sun, the moon and the stars should fall down from heaven and pass away.

That the doctrine of eternal punishment sends terror to the soul of man, who would deny that? It is a most solemn doctrine that can shake the innermost parts of man. We cannot conceive of anyone preaching this doctrine with a light heart; we can only speak and preach about it with sadness. It is the doctrine of the law of Jehovah carried to its last terrible point against the transgressors of the law. If the entire law sends terror to the heart of the unregenerate man the doctrine of eternal punishment is the real cause of his terror. In it the thunders of Sinai are concentrated, as it were; in it they culminate. And that is the very object of this solemn doctrine of eternal punishment; it should terrify the unregenerate man, arouse him out of his spiritual sleep, reveal to him his utter helplessness and carry him to the brink of despair; for then alone when the heart is broken by the hammer of the law can the balm of Gilead, the blood of the Savior, heal the soul and save it from hell. But the fact that this doctrine shocks and terrifies our souls proves absolutely nothing against its truth. If our feelings were to decide what is true or false in the Bible, not a single Christian doctrine would stand; for as it was in olden times, so it is to-day: even the sweetest and most comforting Gospel truths, to say nothing of the stern demands of the divine law, are an offense to the Jews and foolishness to the Greek. We might as well prove the lawfulness of polygamy from the feelings of a Mormon as to prove the absurdity or immorality of eternal punishment from the feelings of some rationalist or any other man.

If we know nothing more about the doctrine of eternal punishment but the solemn declarations of the Bible that such a punishment will be inflicted upon the godless; if we knew of no sufficient reason why it should take place; if we had no adequate cause to assign for it: we would still believe it, because God tells us so. God is just, though we cannot fathom His ways and designs. But God has helped our

weakness, revealed the causes of damnation and fully proved its necessity to us in His holy Word, that we might never be tempted to doubt His justice or His mercy. The deeper our insight into the holy Scriptures, the firmer we will be convinced not only that eternal punishment will surely be the doom of those who die in their sins without faith in their Redeemer, but also that nothing short of infinite suffering can appease the infinite wrath of God against sin, and pay for the infinite crime of the creature rebelling against its Creator. As pelagianism is really at the root of rationalism, also of the denial of the doctrine of eternal punishment: so the Biblical, Lutheran doctrine of sin and of redemption clearly and incontrovertibly proves the necessity of eternal punishment. The seat of unbelief in this as in other doctrines is the unconverted heart of the sceptic. He has no true knowledge of sin; never felt the thunders of Sinai; does not believe in the total depravity of the natural man; has no idea of the heinousness of sin, and naturally thinks God a tyrant for inflicting such terrible punishment for such a little offense as man may be guilty of in his short life here on earth. But if we rightly understand the nature of sin, and the infinite ransom which our Savior had to pay in order to deliver us from sin and hell, we will never for a moment doubt the doctrine of eternal punishment. If we should do so, we would at the same time deny the doctrine of atonement. The one stands and falls with the other. This fact is proved by the rationalists themselves. As soon as one of them denies eternal punishment, the true doctrine of atonement is also gone, being really useless for his system. No wonder that such *advanced* Liberals of the day ridicule this most blessed doctrine of atonement as a coarse arithmetical problem.

The greatest offering possible, the death of God Himself, can have been required only by a crime that merited the greatest suffering possible, eternal death. As the fact that God sent His only begotten Son to redeem the world proves that Christ was the only possible Mediator between God and man, because, as both nature and revelation prove, God never does anything that is unnecessary and certainly would have chosen an easier way if that had been possible: so it also proves the terrible wickedness of sin and the necessity of the wages of sin, death.

We will here adduce a portion of Dr. Philippi's treatise on the office of Christ which has bearing on our subject: (Glaubenslehre IV Kap. 3, p. 25-31.)

"Our faith in the expiatory death of the God-man rests upon the cognition of the sinful condition of our nature. If in our heart we place ourselves face to face with God and measure ourselves according to His law, we recognize the op-

position of our entire being and life against this divine law, as the revealed will of divine holiness, and must confess ourselves transgressors of the holy law. This experience of our opposition against the divine holiness, however, has for its reverse the experience of the opposition of divine holiness against us; and the perception of the energy of the holy essence of God repelling us is nothing else but the feeling of divine wrath which we experience in our conscience. On account of our sins, therefore, there rests upon us by nature the divine wrath, and in the experience of the same, which manifests itself as a feeling of unhappiness, the just punishment of our trespass is executed. But the weight of divine wrath is so great and heavy, that we at the same time recognize, feel and learn in an experience that pierces marrow and bone, that the same cannot be appeased or satisfied with any momentary and passing, but only with perpetual, never ending unhappiness. The adequate punishment for the stupendous greatness of our crime is eternal death.

“Nothing can take from us this weight of divine judgment that presses us to the ground, no works commanded by God, no self-invented satisfaction, no voluntary mortifications and penances. The look at Jesus’ cross alone can relieve us of the feeling and consciousness of our indebtedness, because by faith we behold and experience that the divine wrath resting upon us has been laid upon Jesus, the holy Son of God, who has borne and appeased it in His death that we might be free from it. In this consists the centre of the evangelical experience of salvation, yea the specific character of all true Christian faith. Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world. The chastisement of our peace was upon Him. The death of our Lord is penal suffering, by which we are redeemed from punishment, therefore a vicarious penal suffering.”

“But in what respect can the temporal punishment which our Mediator has endured, be considered a sufficient ransom for the eternal punishment of which we are guilty? To answer this question, which meets us at the very threshold of the doctrine of atonement, we will go back to the essence of sin in its relation to the essence of God.

“As already the *Eritis sicut Deus* of the serpent in Paradise shows, sin in its innermost being is self-deification and therefore in its true tendency destruction of God. As such it challenges God to effectual self-preservation, or the unconditional reaction of divine holiness, the energy of divine wrath. But if this divine wrath, resting objectively in absolute power upon sinful humanity, should also subjectively in absolute effect realize itself upon humanity it would result in annihilation of the created being. For the finite creature may indeed by seeking the destruction of the infinite God

contract an intensively infinite debt, but it cannot, without destruction of its finite being bear the intensively infinite punishment adequate to this debt. The actual annihilation of the creature however, far from being a sufficient atonement for the attempted deicide, would on the contrary cause the divine holiness to become extinct in the very moment of its strongest efficacy. The absolute destruction of the creature would be the annulling of creation, not abolition of sin by punishment; and with the annulling of creation it would at the same time be the annulling of the divine plan of redemption. But thereby divine love would be satisfied as little as divine holiness; both would, on the contrary, be robbed of their realization on the sinful creature. Therefore the objective energy of divine holiness when exercised subjectively against humanity, must be successive. The finite creature must indeed empty the cup of the infinite divine wrath to the dregs, but it cannot drain it at one time; and therefore divine holiness, to get its dues, transforms the intensively infinite into the extensively infinite punishment. The flash of divine wrath is refracted in the centre of finiteness; its absolute concentration unfolds itself in an endless expansion.

"In the death of the God-man sin has fully revealed its hitherto hidden character, because, in its tendency a murderer of God from the beginning, it has, as we have seen, finally progressed to actual suicide. But in all this sinful humanity stood under the secret and unconscious direction of the real murderer and arch-enemy of God and man, who now hoped to reach his old original aim by trying to destroy the God-man and in him God himself either by effectual temptation or by murder. But Jesus, the Son of God, by being nailed to the cross was thereby, at the same time, declared as one given over to the curse of God. And God confirmed this doing of Satan and the world which was none other than the spontaneous execution of His own deliberate counsel and eternal purpose. He Himself placed His only begotten Son under judgment of the curse and gave Him into death in body and soul. And He did suffer death in all its intensity. Not only did the tender and pure body of the holy God-man feel the pains and tortures of death by crucifixion in their deepest intensity, far more deeply and keenly than would our flesh which in comparison with His has become hard and insensible by sin, but his soul moreover was subjected to the full energy of the divine retributive justice to the very point of being forsaken by God; and he has emptied to the last drop in one draught the cup of the infinite wrath of God, which, in spite of His fervent prayer, the Father did not take from Him. Thus the intensively infinite punishment, which was due to the world, has been visited

upon Christ the Son of God, who alone by reason of His divinity could bear it without destruction and annihilation of His being; the absolute death was executed upon the absolute God. God's death for God's death, that is the perfectly adequate equivalent for our guilt. The killing of God as a vicarious penal suffering corresponds to the killing of God as the guilt of sin. The infinite debt that was contracted by the attempt of the absolute destruction of the infinite one himself could only be atoned for in an absolute manner by the infinite penal suffering of absolute death by the infinite one himself. The temporal penal suffering of the Lord, far from being an insufficient ransom for the eternal suffering of sinful humanity, has therefore in the death of the God-man given to the retributive justice of God for the first and only time, and in the only manner possible, not only an absolute, but also an absolutely adequate satisfaction. For here the beam of infinite divine holiness is no longer refracted in the centre of finiteness, but finds in unbroken energy its absolute realization in the sphere of infinity itself. The extensively infinite penal suffering of mankind is sufficient for divine holiness, in so far as it can at all find satisfaction in the finite creature; but the intensively infinite penal suffering of the Son of God is sufficient for it in itself and absolutely. Therefore the death of the God-man has not accomplished more than divine justice had the right to demand, but it has accomplished more than finite humanity was able to offer. This death is no insufficient, but rather a super-abundant satisfaction. And all this is not, as one might think, mere conjecture of subtilizing reason, an abstract dogma of reflection, but a concrete self-unfolding of the deepest Christian experience wrought by the Word and Spirit of God. For in the believing look upon Jesus, the Son of God crucified for us, the immeasurable weight of our guilt sinks of itself into the unfathomable depth of divine mercy gained for us by the perfect atonement."

Thinking Christians will see from this how fallacious are the arguments of the rationalists who try to prove from God's love the absence of His active holiness. Their denouncing God as barbarous will never make Him so; it will only help to drive them into the terrible hands of the ever righteous God. Sin is a child of hell that can be atoned for only by endless suffering in hell, which either we ourselves or our Vicar has to endure. Christ has endured it for us in all its infinite intensity, while hanging on the cross and exclaiming in overwhelming torture: my God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me. For man it is sinful to avenge himself; God the Creator has to do so to preserve Himself as a holy righteous being. No Christian will ever believe God cruel for damning the wicked, but no Christian ever taught that God

rejoiced in the eternal death of the wicked. The oath of God that He has no pleasure in the death of man forbids such a satanic thought; the terrible suffering and death of the Son of God proclaim the infinite love that would save all even at the highest price. The true Lutheran doctrine of atonement in connection with the doctrine of eternal punishment also overthrows most effectually the cheap arguments and cheaper ridicule of the Romanists and many others against our Bible doctrine of either heaven or hell after death. A few weeks ago a Roman Catholic priest lecturing on eternal punishment said: "I must leave it to the Protestant divine to show how it is consistent with reason and justice to punish venial sin, such as a slight impatience with the torments of the same eternal hell which is merited by the crime of deliberate murder. The Catholic Church does not teach that all sins indiscriminately are punished in hell, but only mortal sins, that is, sins which of their very nature turn the soul away from God, by conscious and deliberate rebellion against God's law in a grave matter; sins which cast off and defy his authority." There we have Pelagianism full blown! Not a word about faith or unbelief—not only in this citation, but in the entire lecture as far as given in a lengthy report. Such sentences as the following are plenty: "For if no act that is momentary can merit an eternal punishment, no act of virtue can merit an eternal reward, for acts of virtue are also transient and momentary and there is no proportion between the momentary act, say of loving God and the reward of eternal life." It will be noticed that in this sentence the Romanist argues that wicked deeds can merit eternal punishment, because virtuous deeds can merit eternal life. For an Arminian Methodist or any other Protestant with Pelagian proclivities the riddle of the priest must indeed be hard to solve, if they still believe in eternal punishment. If men build their hopes for the future on their sanctification as most Reformed sects do, at least to a great extent, the division line between saint and sinner will indeed very often be hard to find. The murderer on the cross would have had a poor chance of entering Paradise according to Arminianism. For a Lutheran the riddle which the Romanist propounded for Protestant divines is solved by the Bible, or rather it does not exist at all. We know of but two classes of men, sinners saved and sinners lost; saved, not on account of the works of men, their virtues or their vices, for according to them every man belongs to hell, but on account of the perfect redemption of Jesus that perfectly saves every sinner who truly believes in Him. There is really but one sin now that damns, and that is unbelief, on account of which the Holy Spirit was to reprove the world according to Christ's promise; the sin which the world does not even consider such but often boasts of as a virtue.

The words of Christ will stand forever: "He that believeth, and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned."

THE DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER IN MODERN THEOLOGY.

Reviewed and criticized by Dr. F. A. Philippi; tr. from the Kirchliche Glaubenslehre of the author by G. H. S.

CONCLUDED.

Considered from any side whatsoever we see that the symbolical interpretation is an impossibility. If in the Lord's Supper there were a purely symbolical act, then the words in which this is recorded could not have been more inappropriately chosen than has been done. We would then have in these words a masterpiece of confusion in grammar and logic. Only he who starts out with the purpose of being misunderstood and of confusing others can speak in such a manner. If men had not approached the exegesis of the words of institution with the dogmatical prejudices that it was impossible that those words should ordain the body of Christ to be eaten with the mouth, since this contradicts sense and reason, they would never have thought of a figurative interpretation. It is further a most surprising phenomenon that while all the other symbolical acts and words of the Scriptures are recognized as such by the unanimous agreement of the commentators, only in this one place there is a debate as to the literal or figurative interpretation of the words. That the figurative interpretation did not flow *a posteriori* from an unbiased exegesis of the words, but was an *a priori* presupposition imagined to be necessary and accepted before the exegesis of the passage and only later laid into the words, is apparent from the embarrassment of the defenders of this view in their endeavor to give an exegetical reason for their position. They sometimes sought for it in the subject, sometimes in the copula, sometimes in the predicate, sometimes in the structure of the sentence, and one attempt has proved to be more forced and impossible than the other. In the dogmatical idea lying at the bottom of these attempts they were all agreed; but in regard to the exegesis no two agreed. Therefore Schleiermacher, who has set up a doctrine of the Lord's Supper entirely peculiar, confesses that the exegesis of the words of institution has not yet been satisfactorily concluded, but was capable of and needed further development and must remain open for ever renewed examination and research.

The attempt is made to seek a defense for these presup-

positions behind the disciples and to make them partakers in the guilt. It is thought that these could in no manner have understood the words of the Lord in a literal sense, for how could they have believed that the Christ who was sitting bodily before them, was also giving them His body to be eaten? What then they could not understand, it is thought Christ could not have said to them or asked them to believe. In this manner a hermeneutical principle is set up, according to which nearly all the words of Holy Writ, and especially the most important utterances of Christ can be deprived of their very soul. But when did the Lord measure His words by the measure of intelligence in His hearers and say only that which was at that moment intelligible to them? Then He would have been compelled to keep silent altogether about His divine sonship and His death of atonement. Not even when He finds that His words have been entirely misunderstood, does He also endeavor to remove the misunderstanding, but He continues, without taking further notice of this misunderstanding, to make mysterious statements concerning His person and work. To you is given, He says, Matt. 13, 14, Mark 4, 11, to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God, but not to those who are without. Yes, these *shall* not hear, although having ears to hear, nor see, although having eyes to see, because their heart is hardened. But those also whose hearts were open and who received the truth, nevertheless misunderstand His words often enough, or did not understand them: something that can be seen in the conduct of His disciples again and again; and John, in his Gospel c. 2, 22 expressly says of a certain utterance of the Lord, that they did not understand it until after His resurrection. Even after the resurrection they did not yet know the Scriptures that He should rise from the dead, John 20, 9, although He had told this to them frequently before, and it is said of His own parents, Luke 2, 50, that they did not understand the words which He was speaking to them. The decisive point is here not what the disciples understood, or according to the circumstances could have been expected to understand, but what the Lord has said. Even if they did not at that moment understand what the Lord did in the institution of His Supper, yet the words which He had spoken to Peter when He washed the feet of the disciples applied to them all in this instance, John 13, 7: "What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt know hereafter." It was sufficient if they were only willing in humility to receive the words of the Lord, no matter how mysterious they as yet sounded to their ears, and to accept them in the sense in which He intended them and they would suffer themselves to be reminded of them and instructed in them in full by the Holy Spirit who was to come later.

But who, on the other hand, will maintain and prove that the disciples did not at that time already really understand the Lord? We certainly find that at times they have been raised by the enlightenment of the Holy Spirit above the level of ordinary intelligence, as when Peter calls Christ the Son of the living God, Matt. 16, 16, of which confession the Lord expressly says that it came not from flesh and blood but from the revelation of the Father; or when Peter, not only in his name but also in the name of all the disciples says in John 6, 68. 69: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life and we believe and are sure, that Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Such sudden inspirations of the Spirit we see also in Nathanael when He first met the Lord, John 1, 50, and says: "Rabbi, Thou art the Son of God, Thou art the King of Israel;" whereupon the Lord promises to all of His disciples, that from now on they would see the heavens open and the angels of the Lord ascending and descending upon the Son of man, which manifestation of divine glory as the glory of the only begotten Son of the Father He soon afterwards reveals before their eyes at the marriage feast at Cana, so that the disciples believe in Him as the Son of God who had been revealed in His glory, John 2, 11. Is it so difficult, in view of this, to believe that in the solemn moments of their last meeting with the Lord and Master, when they certainly listened with especially marked attention to His words, and received them in simplicity and humility, they, by the illumination of the Holy Spirit, understood these words in the sense in which they were spoken, no matter how wonderful and inexplicable they sounded to them? Had they not already seen many miracles that surpassed their understanding, some of which were effected by Him, the Son of God, and others of which He, the Son of God, was the object, such as His wonderful transfiguration on the mountain, His wonderful disappearance and departure from within the midst of His enemies? A miracle is a miracle, and it is the sign of a narrow-minded soul to detract anything from its wonderful character. We must believe either all of the miracles recorded in the Word of God, or none at all.

We have thus seen that philologically the symbolical interpretation of the words of institution is an impossibility. On the other hand, the philological impossibility of the literal interpretation no exegete, as far as we know, has ever maintained. And indeed it is logically impossible to maintain that when I say, "This is that," that looked at from the standpoint of language, this cannot mean, "This is really that which I predicate of it." The opponents therefore must be content with denying the possibility of the fact in the literal interpretation, and then to be satisfied with having

tried to prove that the figurative interpretation is philosophically possible. We have however refuted both of these arguments already.

But we must go one step further and maintain that even if philologically the symbolical interpretation of the words of institution were a possible fact, as this is now not a fact, that even then this symbolical interpretation would be an impossibility in fact. Even if from a purely grammatical standpoint we would have the free choice between the literal and the figurative interpretation, we would nevertheless be compelled to decide in favor of the former. The reasons for this lie in the person of the founder, in the character of the institution and in the circumstances under which this was ordained. When the departing Lord establishes an ordinance for His disciples as an abiding memorial of His atonement, this will, no matter whether the word *διαθήξη* is to be translated testament or covenant, have the character of a last will. The expressions of a testamentary institution, concerning which the *ώδεις ἀντετέλη ἐπιδιατάσσεται* Gal. 3, 15 is said, are to be taken in a literal sense, as indeed is the case in the interpretation of a *locus classicus*, which is to be regarded as a *sedes propria* of a *doctrina scripturae sacrae*, unless all scriptural interpretation is to be deprived of a firm foundation; and if the possibility of a scriptural *analogia fidei* is to be maintained, then the literal interpretation of the words must be preserved. And if further these are words of the testament, not of an ordinary human being, but of the Son of God Himself, "the faithful and true witness," Rev. 3, 14, they must be received with all the greater reverence and be accepted just as they read. To this must be added that they are the words of the last will of the Son of God, who is not only the eternal Truth itself, but also the omnipotent Lord, who is able to accomplish what He has said. No matter, therefore, how impossible the contents may seem to human reason, yet faith, which indeed is not the possession of every man, answers in childlike humility, "Be it unto me according to Thy word; there is nothing impossible with God, and what He promises, He will surely do." For that reason Luther, and with him the confessions and the older teachers of our church, have ever laid the principal stress upon this, that the matter was already decided by the very fact that these are the words of the true, almighty Son of God who was making His last will and testament, and that therefore these words are to be taken literally, and not to be turned and twisted, even if a symbolical interpretation were possible, which, however, in this instance is not even the case.

This standpoint over against the words of institution spoken by the Lord certainly presupposes an acknowledgment of His sonship of God as also an absolutely reliable

Word of God, of which the rationalism and the subjectivism of our day has no idea. And for that reason the controversy with these schools of thought is, at the foundation, really not one concerning the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, but rather has its roots in the doctrine of the person of Christ and of inspiration. Only with those then could an understanding with reference to the Lord's Supper be a possibility, who are really in earnest with their faith in the divinity of Christ and with the inspiration of the Word of God. The others will always, on account of their dogmatical standpoint and notwithstanding all the arguments opposed to them from grammar and logic, be compelled to take refuge in the most forced and arbitrary figurative interpretations, and must betray by their disharmony and their guessing as to the word in which the figurative meaning is to be found, that they had their dogma cut and dried before they commenced their exegesis, (something of which they always accuse the defenders of the church's doctrine,) so that the words of institution are afterwards thrown into this dogmatical Procrustes bed and are martyred till they fit into it.

And if we finally glance at the circumstances under which the Lord instituted the Last Supper, we will reach the same conclusion. It was the last Passah festival before He endured the sufferings through which He Himself became the real Paschal Lamb which was offered for the sins of the world, John 19, 36, 1 Cor. 5, 7. As He in this manner put an end to the typical slaying of the Paschal lambs, thus too He ended the typical Paschal supper. The shadow was now to yield to the reality, the *σκιά* to the *σώμα*. How can it then be thought that the Lord would only have put a new shadow in the place of the old, and this too one that still less corresponded to the reality than the older did? Or was perhaps the Paschal lamb that was slain not a more fitting type of the offering of Christ's body than the bread that was broken would have been? Such might pass if the Lord had intended just for once to perform in word and in action before the eyes of His disciples a certain symbolical act. (?) But no, the ceremonial command of constant repetition of such a purely outward memorial act contradicts the character of the "New Testament" which the Lord so strongly emphasizes over against the "Old Testament" cf. Ex. 24, , Heb. 9, 20. This would virtually be a relapse into the ceremonial and legal standpoint, a mixing of the Law and the Gospel. But rather the real Paschal supper had to correspond to the real Paschal Lamb; and this not merely as a spiritual nourishment in faith, which was to be found also in the Old Testament sacred meals, (1 Cor. 10, 3, 4.) but as a bodily eating with the mouth. For not a single word is said in the words of institution concerning a spiritual partaking, but rather is such an idea arbit-

trarily put into the words and connected with them on the basis of groundless presuppositions. If the words, "Take and eat, this is my body," do not mean, "Take and eat with your mouth this body of mine which is really offered to you," but mean rather, "Eat this bread as the symbol of my body to be broken for you on the cross," then they do not signify more than a mere memorial feast. Then they do not say that the true body of Christ is in addition given to faith in a spiritual manner, and it is not even proved that the symbol is of necessity a pledge and that with the sign the thing signified is also offered. And even if this were the case, then in the Lord's Supper nothing else would be given to the believer but what he can receive also in another way, and the specific feature, that distinguishes the Supper, would be the mere symbolical act, the ceremonial action. Just as there is no dogmatic *tertium* between Luther and Zwingli, thus too there is no exegetical *tertium*, and the *tertium* for which Calvin was struggling in the end results exegetically and dogmatically in pure Zwinglianism. And in addition the analogy between the Word and Baptism on the one hand, and of the Lord's Supper on the other, leads to the literal interpretation of the words of institution. If the Word is the bearer of the Spirit, and the water connected with the Word the bearer of the holy Trinity with all God's gifts and grace, as we have learned both to be, then bread and wine are not empty signs but are the bearers of the body and the blood of the Lord.

COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

This Magazine is designed to supply the void long since felt, of a Lutheran periodical devoted to theological discussion. Its aim will be the exposition and defense of the doctrines of the Church as confessed in the Augsburg Concord. Theology in all its departments is embraced in it. Its scope, though for the present special attention will be given to the controverted subject of predestination.

1. The Magazine is published bi-monthly, each number containing 64 pages.

2. The terms are \$2.00 per annum, payable in advance, which includes postage. Single numbers 35 cents.

3. All remittances should be addressed to J. L. Frazee, Agent, Columbus, O. All Communications pertaining to the Editorial Department to Prof. M. Loy, Columbus, O.

The friends of the Magazine are requested to give such aid in its circulation as their circumstances permit.

CONTENTS OF No. VI

	<small>PAGE.</small>
1. SOME OBJECTIONS TO THE DOCTRINE OF INSPIRATION ANSWERED.....	321
2. CHRIST'S DESCENT INTO HELL.....	340
3. A HARMONY OF THE GOSPELS ON THE RESURRECTION	353
4. ETERNAL PUNISHMENT	366
5. THE DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER IN MODERN THEOLOGY...	379

Monies Received for Volume V.

Rev. H. Borchers, \$6.00 in full, S. K. Ulsaker, J. T. Langemo, each \$1.00, Rev. J. A. Schulze, Rev. H. Eisenbach, Rev. C. H. Althoff, Sr., each \$4.00, Rev. P. G. Doepken, Rev. E. Winterhoff, Rev. J. B. A. Dale, Rev. A. Birch, each \$2.00.